

4/1 p/ln
3/6

St Edward's Cambridge Series

VOL. II

RELIGIOUS RECONSTRUCTION
AFTER THE WAR

RELIGIOUS RECONSTRUCTION AFTER THE WAR

A CAMBRIDGE PROGRAMME

BY

JAMES PLOWDEN-WARDLAW

C. T. WOOD

W. EMERY BARNES

J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER

J. K. MOZLEY

S. C. CARPENTER

F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON

F. CONQUEST CLARE

J. R. S. TAYLOR

A. H. F. BOUGHEY

ARTHUR J. TAIT

A. H. M'NEILE

T. G. BONNEY

AND

THE MASTER OF CORPUS

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT

ROXBURGHE HOUSE

PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1916

All rights reserved

DEDICATED
IN AFFECTIONATE MEMORY
TO
ROLAND GEORGE INGLE, B.A.
AGED 30 YEARS
OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE
A MEMBER OF THE CONGREGATION
OF
ST EDWARD THE KING
AND
2ND LIEUTENANT OF THE LINCOLNSHIRE REGIMENT
WHO
WITH MANY BRAVE AND GALLANT COMRADES
DIED FOR HIS COUNTRY
IN THE GREAT BATTLE OF THE SOMME
JULY 1, 1916

" Their bodies are buried in peace, but their name
liveth for evermore."

" Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay
down his life for his friends."

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	9
I. A DEMOCRATIC MINISTRY FOR THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	13
<i>By the Rev. JAMES PLOWDEN-WARDLAW, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, formerly Advocate of the Supreme Courts of Cape Colony and the Transvaal, Vicar- Chaplain of St Edward the King, Cambridge, Chaplain to the Forces. Author of "The Test of War."</i>	
II. THE MESSAGE OF THE WAR TO THE CLERGY	30
<i>By the Rev. C. T. WOOD, M.A., Fellow, Lecturer in Hebrew and Theology, and Dean of Queen's College, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester.</i>	
III. THE NEED FOR REASSERTING THE ENG- LISH CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	40
<i>By the Rev. W. EMERY BARNES, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.</i>	
IV. THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUC- TION AFTER THE WAR	50
<i>By the Rev. J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.</i>	
V. THEOLOGICAL REORIENTATION	61
<i>By the Rev. J. KENNETH MOZLEY, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.</i>	
VI. THE NECESSITY OF DOGMA	72
<i>By the Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Southwell.</i>	

	PAGE
VII. THE HUMAN CHRIST: A STUDY OF THE TEMPTATION	81
<i>By the Rev. F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, M.A., D.D., Fellow, Dean, and Tutor of Jesus College, Cambridge, Hon. Canon of Peterborough.</i>	
VIII. THE SIGN OF JONAH: AN INTERPRETA- TION AND ITS MESSAGE	92
<i>By the Rev. F. CONQUEST CLARE, M.A., Vice-Prin- cipal of Westcott House, Cambridge.</i>	
IX. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EVANGELICAL SPIRIT	103
<i>By the Rev. J. R. S. TAYLOR, M.A., Vice-Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.</i>	
X. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE RENEWAL OF SPIRITUAL LIFE	113
<i>By the Rev. A. H. F. BOUGHEY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Vicar of St Mary the Great, and Rural Dean of Cambridge.</i>	
XI. THE NEED OF A NEW IDEAL OF PREACHING	119
<i>By the Rev. ARTHUR J. TAIT, D.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.</i>	
XII. THE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITHIN THE COLLEGES	127
<i>By the Rev. THE MASTER OF CORPUS.</i>	
XIII. THE CHANGED RELATIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION: PEACE AFTER WAR- FARE	135
<i>By the Rev. T. G. BONNEY, Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S., Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, Hon. Canon of Manchester.</i>	
XIV. THE CHURCH IN ITS CORPORATE CAPACITY	146
<i>By the Rev. A. H. M'NEILE, D.D., Fellow and Dean of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.</i>	

INTRODUCTION

IN the spring of 1916 I went to France with the troops, and during the first few weeks of my absence the writers of the following papers were kind enough to come to my rescue, and to deliver, during the spring, the substance of these essays in the pulpit of St Edward's, Cambridge. My own contribution was of the nature of an introduction to the course, and the substance of it was delivered by me in St Edward's the Sunday before I departed from Cambridge. It has been altered and extended in order to introduce the fresh evidence embodied in the Convocation debates of February and May.

The writers of these papers are responsible only for their own contributions. Each of the three great parties in the Church of England is, I think, represented, and many of the writers would not be in agreement with the opinions expressed by the other contributors. But the different elements in the Church of England, however contradictory they may sometimes appear, may, in their ultimate analysis, form a rich and comprehensive unity. One mind or temperament is not, as a rule, wide enough to contain the whole truth of Christianity, to make its possessor, as it were, a universal Christian.

And so it is necessary to grow, by the stimulating

effect of disagreements, which, wisely treated, need not make a large unity impossible, a unity in diversity. In the forceful language of popular metaphor, the Church of England in modern times has never been a "one-horse show." She drives two horses or three. But, if any travelling is to be done, the horses must not kick each other. And further, they must pull together, lest the nation, losing patience, unharness the whole team, and substitute for them more modern modes of traction.

Let us, therefore, put our party prejudices in our pockets, and take a sane and wide view of every element in the Church of England. The only test of liberalism is to be liberal to institutions or opinions with which one does not agree. There is no virtue in being "liberal" to one's own darling fads. Publicans and sinners do that every day.

But, on the other hand, there is no place in the world like an ancient University where the inclination is more universal than to live in mental and religious grooves. Prejudices become sanctified by the real learning employed to support them.

It is, however, very difficult to be narrow nowadays, for our mental and religious grooves (however much we are entrenched in them) are being shattered by the furious fire of the real and startling facts of this international cataclysm in the midst of which we are now living.

We are conscious of vast changes which are likely to come after the war, and therefore we are bound to take stock of our Church, and to meditate new methods of spiritual business.

I must ask the indulgence of the reader for any shortcomings for which I am responsible. Books

of reference are hard to consult in the war zone, and if such shortcomings are absent, I owe this fact to the trouble and care which the publishers have shown during my absence in France.

J. PLOWDEN-WARDLAW

Chaplain to the Forces.

NO. 12 CASUALTY CLEARING STATION,
2ND ARMY, B.E.F., FRANCE.

I

A DEMOCRATIC MINISTRY FOR THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Rev. JAMES FLOWDEN-WARDLAW, M.A.

PLAIN speaking has its merits. When a member of a congregation hears something in church with which he disagrees, or the reader of a newspaper comes across something with which he is not in sympathy, the first and natural feeling of annoyance ought to give way to the courageous question as to what element of truth there may be in this disagreeable opinion or assertion. Such a person, if at all impartial, must examine himself as to his own neglect of this element of possible truth. Such a person must be content to acknowledge that his general conclusions may have been partly vitiated by the neglect of this particular element of disagreeable truth.

It is a fact, that many learn more from people with whom they disagree, than from people with whom they are in complete sympathy.

Both spiritually and mentally it is a good thing occasionally to hear opinions or assertions with which we disagree. It is a stimulating change, for to listen to comfortable prophesyings has a numbing, rather than a stimulating effect.

But before we proceed to criticize the organization

of the Church of England (a process which we are bound to pursue, if we are not to stagnate in a by-water of the main stream of progress), let us consider for a moment what the Church of England means to many thousands of Englishmen and Englishwomen.

In the first place, the Church of England is older than the English Kingdom. It is older than Parliament. It is, in a sense, the rock from whence England, as we know it now, has been hewn. In all ages since the seventh century it has been bound up with the national life. It is enthroned on the most sacred memories of our childhood, and in our most sacred affections. It has inspired a deep yet sober zeal in numberless hosts of our countrymen, and has been to them in exile and loneliness all over the world like a loadstone leading to all that is most true and most holy.

And so absolutely national has the Church been in its appeal to our peculiar temperament as a nation, that we have taken our Church to almost every village and hamlet to which our race has spread in the four corners of the world. Our temperament will not respond to any foreign presentment of the same Universal Church. And, as Bishop Montgomery says, "it is not easy to speak too highly of the beauty of character of the best types of the most cultured members of the Church of England."¹ It is a high and admirable type. The Church of England is eminently suitable to the reserved, unimaginative, educated Englishman or Englishwoman, and SO FAR, it has succeeded with an almost unqualified success.

¹ "Mankind and the Church," p. xvii.

But is that all ?

It is impossible to think that the universal mission of the Catholic Church, as exemplified in the Church of England, has been adequately carried out by its suitability to any limited class of temperament or education.

Many millions of the masses in England, as contrasted with what are called "the classes," have been lost to the Church of England, the so-called National Church.

Let us test this statement.

Since the war began, some millions of the ordinary young men of the nation have been gathered into great armies, and the chaplains of these armies have been brought into the closest touch with the men composing these armies. They have found (to be entered on the credit side), a great deal of "diffused" Christianity among our soldiers, which shows itself in a spirit of kindness, of comradeship, of self-sacrifice, of good behaviour, of soberness, of a cheerfulness which, although temperamental, has Christian elements behind it. But they find also (to be entered on the debit side), a whole-hearted ignorance of any supernatural truths, a lack of any sense of discipleship, of any loyalty to the Church of England because it is the Church, a widespread undenominational feeling, a total ignorance of the facts of Church history, and a complete estrangement from the Sacraments. Religion in the eyes of a vast majority of ordinary Englishmen is respectability tinged with faint emotion.

All through the debates of Convocation in February and May of this year there seems to be an uneasy feeling that the Church of England, as a

teaching dogmatic Church has failed with the great mass of national manhood.

It is well to be on one's guard in accepting the evidence of great Church dignitaries or famous preachers who have visited the Front for a fortnight, because enthusiastic congregations are easily engineered to meet them, and even they do not receive such a welcome as falls to the lot of an amusing music hall artist, or popular concert singer, who, with the kindness of their fraternity, often come to cheer the monotonous hours of the British soldier.

But there are prominent men in the Orders of the Church of England, who have had continuous experience with the troops. Two members of the lower house of the Canterbury Convocation are chaplains to the Forces, the Archdeacon of Lewes, and Canon Cooper-Marsdin. The Archdeacon of Lewes has been a chaplain from the outbreak of the war, and has had quite unusual opportunities of forming an opinion as to the conditions of the spiritual life of the men who now form the army.¹

The Archdeacon of Lewes is not altogether a pessimist, for he acknowledges, in a letter to the Archdeacon of Surrey, that there is a wonderful opportunity before the Church of England, and that "the religious interest both among officers and men is growing stronger all the time."²

But he does not hesitate to acknowledge the failure in many directions of the Church of England on the manhood of the nation, and tells us that "what he felt lay at the root of the failure of the

¹ "Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation," 1916, p. 236.

² *Ibid.*, p. 237.

Church was that the clergy had never really got into touch with the men, and that they did not know that that was the case." ¹

He deprecates the ostrich-like trust in the comfortable statistics of the Army. He acknowledges that the Church has not got the men. "Church people," he says, "must not think for one moment that they had got the men or anything like the men. . . . At present 76 per cent. of the troops were Church of England, but he would be afraid to say how many of that 76 per cent. would prove, on analysis, to be true members of the Church of England on the basis of communicant membership." ² . . . "For the most part they were not communicants." ³

He further reminds us that if the Church of England seems to be a failure in the national armies of to-day, such failure means the failure of the Church at home with the same classes. For "it must be remembered," he says, "that the men with whom the chaplains were dealing out at the Front and at the bases were not, in the strict sense of the word, soldiers: they were civilians in uniform; and if there was any failure in religion, it was the failure of the Church at home," ⁴ for "the chaplains were dealing with the men whom the home parishes had sent out to them, and the defects which they had were the defects of the teaching of the organization at home." ⁵ The men "did not understand the Church as a living body." ⁶ "The clergy had not made Christ a living factor in men's minds.

¹ "Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation," 1916, p. 183.

² *Ibid.*, p. 183.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

It was quite a new idea to men to be told that the Church was a living body with a living Head and that they were living members." ¹

"Frankly speaking," says the Archdeacon, "the services of the Church of England had not attracted the men." ² They "had absolutely no use for the long morning service." ³ "The men would not be helped or reached by what people were at present accustomed to." ⁴ He thinks that we shall have to commence all over again at the very beginning; that the Church "would have to regard itself as being entirely a missionary Church." ⁵ "If the clergy were really to do anything with the men when they came back again, they would have to be very, very patient, and they would have to begin from the beginning." ⁶

This is the verdict of a skilful and devoted man, after twenty-one months' service with the men he loves.

But Canon Cooper-Marsdin, who has also served with the troops as chaplain, is even more inclined to be pessimistic. He lately said in Convocation that "he felt very strongly that if all the members of the House held temporary commissions as chaplains to His Majesty's Forces, they would find it exceedingly difficult to be optimistic." ⁷

And certainly in the case of many thousands of these "C. of E.'s" there is a certain helplessness both in the dying man and in the chaplain which arises from the fact that the truths of religion, such as the nature of sin, repentance, forgiveness, absolution,

¹ "Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation, 1916, p. 186."

² *Ibid.*, p. 184.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

atonement, sacramental grace, the nature of bodily death, the bright hopes for the future, are unfamiliar truths totally unrelated to the bygone experience of the dying man.

And experienced naval chaplains tell the same tale of the misty vagueness of belief in the case of those who label themselves in the service jargon "C. of E." The Reverend W. J. Casey of Pusey House, Oxford, now chaplain to H.M.S. "Warspite," who has always "mixed with and lived among men," says with regard to the semi-paganism of those magnificent and courageous men the following tragic words: "The real, naked, stark tragedy was, and is, that our English lads do not—as a whole—know how to pray as Christians, how to live as Christians, or how to die as Christians. It is magnificent to die singing "Tipperary," but it is not Christian unless some prayer precedes or follows. Even a gallant death is not a Christian death, unless it is the climax of a Christian life, or the seal put on the championship of a Christian cause."¹

And again, "It must be clear to any honest observer that the English people have practically lost the Sacraments."²

And as regards the numbers of communicants Mr Casey says: "I have a letter lying by me from a chaplain in France, with a cavalry regiment, praising the men most highly, but saying that (excluding officers) only one man made his communion at Christmas, though every opportunity was given."³ He goes on to give his experience

¹ "Have you understood Christianity?" p. 82.

² *Ibid.*, p. 77.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

in the Navy. "I believe," he says, "that the average number of communicants on a battleship is above the average on shore, yet I think that, if one in ten made their communions at Christmas or Easter, it would be regarded as wonderfully good."¹

The Convocation committee in their report on "the spiritual needs of sailors and soldiers after the war" do not mince matters. With regard to the 76 per cent. *soi-disant* members of the Church of England so registered in the Army, the committee say that, "though nominally members of the Church, their membership had aroused in them no enthusiasm, and exercised little direct influence over their lives. . . . They acknowledge that they have almost entirely ceased to pray; . . . they make no secret of the fact that they have forgotten most of what they ever knew about the elements of the Christian faith."² This state of things, continues the Report, is "serious, because it shows that the Church has not yet discovered how to help and how to teach. If the Church is convinced that there has been some serious failure, then it must be prepared to make very considerable alterations in its methods of work."³

If the Archdeacon of Lewes was right in saying that the Army is now the civilian population in arms, and that "if there was any failure in religion it was the failure of the Church at home," then the churchmanship of the civil population before the war should surely tell the same tale of in-

¹ "Have you understood Christianity?" p. 77.

² "Report of the Committee" (1916, No. 496), p. 2.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

adequacy, which is patent in our modern Navy and Army.

A writer in the "Church Times" admits that "the great masses of workers in this country are passing out of all relation with organized Christianity."¹

Lord Salisbury, speaking generally, and of all denominations, said in May of this year that "between organized religion and the mass of the working classes, there was a lack of touch which must be admitted."²

But as regards churchmanship the most obvious and efficient outward test is the fact of being a communicant. That is seldom or never the test of which a "C. of E." soldier makes use himself. Baptism and Holy Communion are no test to him. His baptism in the Church of England was an event for which he was not responsible. In a majority of cases he has no desire for confirmation (which he receives probably in many instances as a matter of courtesy to an energetic and popular chaplain), and no desire for Holy Communion, which he regards as an "extra" for the extremely pious. His tests of belonging to the Church of England are two, namely, an occasional attendance at Sunday evening service, or the fact that he belongs to no other body, and must, therefore, because he is an Englishman, belong, in the Army at least, to the Church of England.

But, as the Church of England is still theoretically a sacramental Church, the test of communion is still the best rough test of a man's intention to make himself an active instead of a nominal member of the Church of England.

¹ "Church Times," p. 488 (1916).

² *Ibid.*, p. 458 (1916).

Taking a period a few years before the war, we find, that in the few northern dioceses in the Province of York, only between four and five persons out of every hundred were communicants in the Church of England.

For instance, in the diocese of Durham, which in 1901 had a population of considerably over a million, forty-three thousand were communicants of the Church of England. And yet in this war at least 70 per cent. of the soldiers declare themselves to be members of the Church of England.

When all allowance has been made for children and members of other religious bodies, surely it is a grave symptom that in the northern parts of England, the country of Aidan and Cuthbert, only 4.8 per cent. of the population should be communicants in the National Church, and yet that over 70 per cent. of the whole number of soldiers should be nominal members of the Church of England.

When Convocation dealt last May with the spiritual needs of sailors and soldiers after the war, it proposed four remedies for this vague and nominal churchmanship to which historical circumstances have reduced the average Englishman.

First came "the failure of the Church to teach."¹ The truth of this accusation, in the words of Dr A. W. Robinson, "was too patent to all to be palliated or ignored."² And various methods were suggested by which the Church of England should teach a plain message to the unlearned man.

Then, after a discussion and resolution on Christian fellowship, which we shall notice presently, the

¹ "Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation," 1916, p. 241.

² *Ibid.*, p. 241.

defects of public worship were discussed, and Mattins was put in the dock and condemned as a usurper. It was asserted that English Christianity had "settled down to a conviction that the Holy Communion was not essential, that it might be regarded as an extra, doubtless a very important and valuable extra, but an extra."¹ "The supernatural element had become less and less conspicuous."² "The results had been seen in many ways—in reduced congregations, in the tendency to go to other cults which offered something which seemed to be more real and more vital than the ordinary arrangements of the English Church."³ By a very large majority a resolution was carried, which provided, as a substitute for a dethroned Sunday Mattins, a celebration of the Holy Communion as the principal Sunday service.

And then the prayer-meeting, a method common both to Nonconformists and extreme Churchmen like Father Dolling and Father Stanton,⁴ was put forward as a means of deepening the spiritual life in every parish. The Regular services stereotyped prayer. The Prayer-meeting, on the other hand, restored that atmosphere of freedom which was really needed for prayer.

Let us go back to the second of the Convocation resolutions, that on Christian fellowship. Such Christian fellowship cannot be created by vague official aspirations, but can only be formed by methods which cut deep down into our present system, methods which open the ministry

¹ "Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation," p. 287 (Dr A. W. Robinson).

² *Ibid.*, p. 287. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 287. ⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 315 and 336.

fully and freely to men of all classes, and make the Church of England a great democratic community.

The Bishop of London, who is in intimate contact with so many sections of his great and representative diocese, was the only speaker in Convocation who alluded to the problem of a democratic ministry.

He says that "the world of labour did not seem to look to the Church for advice in its troubles, and the Church must ask itself, whether, because the ministry was drawn largely from the more learned classes, and depended upon the rich for subscriptions, it had not acquired a class bias?"¹

Those who have had any breadth of experience must have noticed that when a religious body succeeds, be that religious body ultra-Protestant or ultramontane, it always draws a proportional number of its ministers from the actual classes in which it succeeds. Nonconformity draws its ministers chiefly from those limited classes in which it is successful. The peasant-priest has a great place all over the world-wide communion of the Roman Church. He has his social disadvantages, but, to balance them, he has the unique advantage of making the Roman Catholic workman know that the Church is his as well as that of the neighbouring landowner. His Jacques or Pierre, his Timothy or Patrick, has an equal opportunity with the noble's son of ministering to the community in the holiest offices of religion.

At present, perhaps, 25 to 30 million of the total population of England and Wales are not represented

¹ "Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation," p. 334.

(with the exception of cases trifling in number), in the ranks of the Church of England ministry. Is it a matter of wonder that a large proportion of these millions do not come to church, however cultured and perfect our service may be? Religion must come to every man in terms of his own understanding, not in the terms of another man's understanding. And no man understands any class better than the man who has been born and bred in it. At present, if there happens to be a working-class clergyman, he is such a unique object, that he tends rapidly to assimilate himself with the surrounding clergy. He is in a short time absorbed into another social environment, and his intensely valuable experience of his own class is practically lost in his changed social condition.

But further, the upper middle class, from which most of our clergy are drawn, has failed to man the ranks of the Church of England ministry in sufficient numbers.

The figures have been prepared for the thirteen years from 1893 to 1906. In this period the population increased by four million. "This increase of population needed an increase of 1500 in the number ordained. But, instead of this increase the number has decreased by 1500."¹ Provided every clergyman is to minister to 3000 people an increase of over 100 clergymen a year is needed, whereas before the war there was an annual deficiency of about 120 clergymen a year. Although the population increased in normal times by 6000 a week, confirmations and communions were nearly stationary."²

¹ "Father Bull's pamphlet on Urgent Church Reform," p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 4 and 5.

Therefore, if we do not transform our methods, the deficiency after the war is likely to be much greater. For the Church of England must rise even in its methods of recruiting the ministry to the opportunities of the new age after the war. At present a large part of the working-class population has escaped from the Church of England. Anglicanism, on the whole, is not the working-man's religion, and after the war it must be the task both of the leaders and of the ordinary communicant to see that, as far as in them lies, the Church of England becomes once more the religion of the people. It is not the fault of the individual that the Church of England is mainly the Church of the comfortable and leisured classes. It is the fault of the system.

But very few would dispute this further statement, that, if every communicant of the Church of England were fully conscious of the defects of our system, of our services, of our methods, of our elaborate network of inhibitions which prevent reform and hinder the mass of English people from looking on the Church of England as *their own* Church, then the defects would be swept away in twelve months, and, in a generation, the Church of England might be again the Church of the People.

At present there are some grounds for saying that we have "a class ministry with a money qualification,"¹ a money qualification, we may add, needed for an expensive education and to supplement the absurd stipends of £40 to £60 a year now given in many cases to married clergymen in the Church of England.

¹ Father Bull's "Urgent Church Reform," p. 4.

Holy Orders is a gentlemanly profession, an alternative for being an officer in the Army or Navy, or being called to the Bar. But, in future, it must become an occupation possible to any earnest, sincere young man with a vocation, who is capable of a good seven years' training in a free university.

What is always possible for the intelligent Irish peasant in the Roman Catholic church, or, in many cases, though probably in a lesser degree, for the Scottish village lad in the Presbyterian Church, ought to be possible for every working-man's son in England who has brains and vocation. We have just to put mere social position on one side for the sake of souls. The Church of England will never become the church of the people until in seven churches out of ten one hears at the altar or in the pulpit the manly provincial accent of the elementary school.

If mere culture and mere social position in the English clergy are to issue in the shutting out of other classes from the ministry, and hence to alienate half the nation, then, for Heaven's sake, let us have a democratized ministry and gather the whole nation into the Church.

Father Bull of Mirfield has outlined a scheme which might be carried out, not merely as a party venture like Kelham or Mirfield, but as a national scheme.

According to this scheme, we have to raise the number of ordinands from 685 (the number for 1912), to 2000 per year, that is to say, increase it threefold. It is proposed that the classes from which our ministry is now recruited should furnish 500, which will amply represent the cultured and

leisured classes, and that the other 1500 should be the ablest recruits that can be obtained from the working classes. The Church itself would provide these 1500 with free education from sixteen to twenty-three years of age.

Father Bull proposes a means of doing this.

There are about two million Easter communicants. He suggests that a levy of two shillings a year on all communicants would produce £200,000 a year, which would be ample for the free education per year of 1500 men on frugal lines.¹

It is said that if the Archbishops asked for it, the money would be given at once, and so once more the mass of English people would learn to look on the Church as their own, to receive the sacraments from the hands of their own sons, and to hear the Word of God and the doctrines of the Universal Church from the lips of their own children.

But it is said, on the other hand, that the generality of people (including the working-class) prefer to have the clergy drawn from the class which used to provide officers for the Army or Navy. The writer has often believed this. It is true, probably, in many individual cases. And further, there is always a great tendency to be willing to believe this, because it flatters the self-love of all who have been educated at the great public schools or universities.

But is it true in anything like a large sense?

How can it be true, when, although the Church of England has a ministry drawn on the whole from a higher social class than any other religious body, it still finds itself with under 5 per cent. of the

¹ Bull's "Urgent Church Reform," p. 11.

total population of the North as communicants? It does not look as if the ordinary man was so very much enamoured of clergy educated at the public schools.

There is no reason why a democratized ministry should be any less learned than a "class" ministry. The writer remembers more than twenty years ago an undergraduate scholar of a famous Cambridge college who had begun life as a street urchin at Plymouth selling newspapers in the street without shoes or stockings. He died in the long vacation of 1893 of rapid consumption, but he promised to be one of the most learned and progressive minds that the University had produced for many years. And the great codifier of the Canon Law, the late Pope Pius X., many a time went to school as a peasant boy without shoes or stockings. The material is all there in these sons of the people if the Church of England is large-minded enough and scientific enough to train it.

If the Church of England is again to be the church of the nation it must be democratized. It must again become the Church of those who toil by hand, for it is one with the Church which was founded by the foster-son of the carpenter, and nurtured by the fishermen of Galilee. And then again, through the lips of the Church of England, the "common people"¹ (or, as the Greek original has it, "the great multitude," the mass of the people) will hear our Lord gladly.

¹ St Mark xii. 37.

II

THE MESSAGE OF THE WAR TO THE CLERGY

By the Rev. C. T. WOOD, M.A.

TO the Christian Church, and to every individual member of it, this war brings a supreme challenge to repent, and it cannot be too often repeated that Christian repentance is not only or mainly regret for the past, but is that change of outlook which will bring a better future. And if we are told, as we are told by the world-weary, that the war shows how little human nature changes though outward forms and institutions take new shapes ; if we are tempted in darker hours to believe that " the struggle nought availeth," yet we know, thank God ! that it is not true. Christ is risen and is present to give power to His disciples : it is no exaggeration to say, " I can do all things in Christ which strengtheneth me " : it is no blind faith which tells us we can bring out of our treasure things old and new. Whether we will or no, this war is changing the whole face of the world—for better or for worse. The ultimate effects depend supremely on the efforts and prayers of the Christian Church. If the risk is immeasurable, so is the hope. To all men surely it now stands revealed what civilization means with God left out ; what is the

certain outcome of human greed and falsehood and materialism. And to the Church comes the cry, "Where is your faith, your power? Why have you slept or quarrelled, while the devil did his work in the world? Awake, and Christ shall give the light." When the war is over, there will probably be a time of reaction from its pain and struggle: but this only means that we need the power and grace of Christ tenfold "lest we forget."

If this is the supreme message of the war to us all, it is especially so to the clergy, who are the ministers or servants of Christ's Church in a special sense. They above all need a simpler and a humbler heart, with penitence and faith ever renewed in daily waiting on Christ. But environment lays its clutch on us all: and it is not out of place to ask what may be done outwardly to make their ministry more effective in the changing conditions of our times, and how they may fit in better alongside the lay priests of the Church: the "return to Christ," the inward renewal, stands first; but outward influences are also very strong.

Institutional religion is the most conservative of all forces. The Church of England is like one of our old Cambridge Colleges, with buildings of various dates down to the seventeenth century: rich with the beauty of age and long tradition, speaking ever of the hopes and fears and consolations of men long ago, and of the unfailing inspiration which they found in Christ Jesus; but, for all that, buildings which would be strangely incongruous and out of place, if they were needed as industrial centres of manufacture. Some years ago a shrewd Hindu, who was studying the effects of Christianity

on the life of European states, came to see me. I asked him what was his impression of the Church of England. "Oh," he said, "it's impressive: but, of course, it is entirely feudal." Yes, "feudal" is the word that hits off our weaknesses. Thank God the last fifty years have witnessed an enormous improvement in the general standard of the Clergy, as seen in their deeper sense of responsibility, their new interest in the "social problem," and in the general level of their spiritual life. Yet, in spite of all, we seem to see an ever-widening gulf between Clergy and Laity, which most emphatically is not due to a growth of unspirituality in the latter. Its chief cause is to be sought in the feudal ideas which still prevail in our beloved Church. While the times have grown more democratic, our organization has almost stood still: whatever advance has been made, has been in spite of our rules and formulæ—almost in defiance of them. Our whole constitution recalls the ages when God was regarded as the great feudal Overlord—and the earthly King as His representative; and the Clergy, as subordinate feudal chiefs in their parishes, bearing a sway which is almost absolute in its sphere as long as it conforms to articles and formulæ which themselves breathe the spirit of a medieval conception of religion. Trust your man more, and your system less, I say: then if he prove unworthy of your trust, remove him. On the one hand, give him freedom—freedom in the interpretation of dogma and articles of belief, and freedom in liturgical usage and its adaptation to modern needs. On the other hand, take stricter measures to restrain individual vagaries, and to see that his freedom is

exercised in loyalty to the Bishops as well as in consideration of the wishes of the congregation.

It may be thought that this plea savours of Nonconformity. Possibly so: but we have much, very much to learn from the Nonconformists. I am not pleading for the ultra-democratic, sectional system of the Congregationalists; but for something that lies between that and the ultra-feudalism of the Church of England. Surely we are right in supposing that the great lesson of the last three hundred years has been this, that God Himself rules not as an Absolute King, but as the Father of His people. If that be true even of Him, how much more should it be true of sinful and ignorant men. Has not God revealed to us just the great outlines of His Holy Will and its foundation in His heart of love, while He leaves us to interpret these in action, to apply them to the ever-changing circumstances of life? So alone does man, the individual and the race alike, gain the strength of a son, and climb from height to height in the evolution of history. The Holy Spirit does indeed guide us, as Christ promised: but it is in a large freedom, which develops individuality; not in a rigid rule which crushes it.

But enough of general principles. Let me try to sketch in rough outline the sort of change which I believe to be vital if the Church of England is to be the Church of England after the war.

I

First, as to the feudal overlordship of the Clergy: here, far above all other abuses, stands out that

incredible iniquity popularly known as the " Parson's Freehold " : for it is surely incredible that, when a Priest is once instituted to a Parish he is still well-nigh as absolute in things parochial as the Tudor monarchs were in matters of state. He must indeed read services on Sunday, sleep so many nights in his Parish, and avoid preaching extreme heresy. But he may be incompetent or tyrannical ; he may be unspiritual and worldly ; he may even be drunken or vicious ; but as long as he does not parade his vices in public, no one can touch him—neither Bishop, nor Parishioners, nor any one else. The wonder is that there is not more abuse of this freehold ; but there are tragedies enough, God knows. The only apology ever offered for this state of things, is that it leaves a clergyman free to attack evils in his Parish without fear of consequences. But it is a freedom dearly bought. Is there any other department of modern life where such a position is tolerated ? Yet there are many in which an official is reasonably free to attack abuses. The same excuse is put forward to cover another evil in our Church system—an evil not indeed comparable to that mentioned above, yet sufficiently intolerable. I refer to the fact that Parishioners have no voice in the selection of a new Incumbent. It would be easy to devise a system which should give reasonable freedom to the Clergy without neglecting the rights of the Laity. As it is, a man may come to a Parish and override every wish of those whom he calls his " people " ; he may change every tradition of the place in flat defiance of all they hold true, and simply tell them that he means to teach them better things. How many Parishes actually have Councils which are

consulted before a change is made? Is it strange if the Laity neglect their lay Priesthood? What encouragement do they get to play their part?

But even worse is the frame of mind thus fostered in the Parish Priest himself. He is apt to regard his own beliefs as the criterion of religious truth. Too often he fails to establish any real intimacy or brotherhood between himself and his people. He may ask them to tea in the Parish Room, much as a squire entertains his tenants; but too often he does not stand shoulder to shoulder with them in life, and so he remains quite ignorant of their real beliefs and unbeliefs. Probably every true dogma can be interpreted in terms of daily life—of fatherhood, motherhood, sonship, friendship, duty: the Incarnation and Atonement are implicit in the mystery of parent love. Yet how often the Clergy preach dogma as if it had some value of its own, as part of a system and apart from life; and, in such cases, how seldom do their hearers either care about or believe it, and the preacher does not even know this!

Abolish the "Parson's Freehold"; give the Laity some voice in the election of their Clergy, and some power in the Parish Council; and you will go a long way to break down the barrier between Priest and people, and to make our Church alive.

II

But, secondly, I venture to plead that in other directions the Clergy should have more freedom—especially in the interpretation of Articles of Belief and in liturgical usage; that, as I said above, we

should trust the man more and the system less even while we hold the man to strict account if he abuse the freedom.

A leading Nonconformist, Dr Orchard, in an article contributed to "The Challenge" of April 14 last, puts the point admirably, in discussing possible terms of reunion with the Church of England. Space forbids me to quote more than a short extract. He says: "The present terms of subscription (in the Anglican Church) would have to go. Some of us find the Articles as antiquated as the Westminster Confession, and altogether too Protestant for our tastes; some of us could only take the Creeds as '*symbola fidei*,' and consent to them as '*disciplinæ arcanæ*' reserved for theological and catechumenical instruction. . . . The Prayer Book, which many of us love and admire almost as much as yourselves, nevertheless needs to be revised and amplified in order to provide more variety, and in most services there ought to be room for spontaneous and silent prayer." Surely he is right. The present system of subscription to Articles and Creeds rests on a medieval conception which is essentially false; namely, that Christianity implies adherence to a certain number of fixed intellectual propositions: that Christ came to teach us certain truths rather than the truth, rules of life rather than guiding principles, mechanical obedience rather than "the glorious liberty of the sons of God." You cannot lay down intellectual deductions, which can be accepted without some modification in a later age, when categories of thought have changed. What has happened in the Church of England? First, subscription to the Articles and Creeds keeps out

of the ministry some of the biggest men, whom we most want. Secondly, we men in Orders are taught to interpret, for example, the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed, or the question about unfeigned belief in all Canonical Scriptures in the Ordination Service, in a sense other than the plain, literal meaning of the words : that is to say, we are taught to quibble, in the very spirit which has at times made the ecclesiastical conscience a byword for dishonesty. The modern form of general *Assent* to the Articles is worthless as a safeguard : it is merely a mischievous anachronism.

You may base your Christianity on either of two principles : on the *exclusive* principle of the Church of Rome and of the old-fashioned Nonconformist sect : or on the *inclusive* principle, which is surely the real spirit of the Church of England ; which is certainly the spirit of the most living religious movement of our times, the Student Christian Movement. It is easy to mock at the principle of inclusiveness as if it would abolish all clear-cut belief and end in a syncretic religion of vague sentiment. But we cannot forget that the Church to which our Lord and His Apostles belonged, the Jewish Church of the first century, was the broadest Church imaginable, including even Sadducees with their disbelief in the very existence of the spiritual ; and yet our Lord never uttered a word of disapproval.

Trust your man, I say again, and not your system. Give him a large and a wise liberty, as long as you secure his respect for the rights of the Laity and his obedience to the rule of the Bishops (neither of which is secured at present). Give him some

freedom in liturgical usage—freedom to change a lesson in the Lectionary which is unsuitable, or to drop the use of the imprecatory Psalms with their appalling savagery ; freedom to pray at a public service, simply and naturally in his own words, for some need revealed by the passing week.

III

Finally let me make two points, briefly but most earnestly. First, when this war is over, and men, who have faced death day by day, come home, there will be no room for unreality in worship—for the wearisome drone of monotoned prayer, for the æsthetic quaintness of a medieval survival, for the recital of a liturgy as a mechanical “ office ” at such a pace that even the educated cannot echo the petitions. If our Church is to meet their needs, humbug and cant must vanish ; we must be simpler, more real, more straight, more brotherly, more large-minded and large-hearted.

And lastly, we *must* have reunion in Christendom. It is surely no longer tolerable that bodies of Christians, equally devout, equally effective in missionary work (which is the supreme test), loving one Father, serving one Lord and Saviour, inspired by one Holy Spirit, should go on thwarting each other while the tide of unbelief and wickedness rises unchecked. We *must* have reunion, or the world will find a larger Christianity without us : we *can* have it, giving up nothing that we hold dear except our exclusiveness, if we are equally ready to allow others to give up nothing which they in their turn hold dear ; if we admit what the facts of history

have proved, that our distinctive beliefs are of the "*bene esse*" of Christianity, not of its "*esse*"; if we allow the Church of England to stand on the basis of its own sweet-reasonableness and not on the basis of medieval compulsion. We can have unity on such terms—not uniformity—as the family of God: "Sirs, ye are all brethren." "Whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, he is My brother and sister and mother."

III

THE NEED FOR REASSERTING THE ENGLISH CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Rev. W. EMERY BARNES, D.D.

IN the two last chapters of the Book of the Revelation St John writes of a City which "comes down out of heaven from God." A description at the same time so simple and so august baffles at first the intelligence of the reader. He does not realize the fact that this City is set up on earth, nor the further fact that it has to do with the earth as it is. Yet St John connects the City in decisive words with human history, both past and present. The names of the tribes of Israel, God's ancient people, are inscribed upon its gates, and the kings of the nations bring their glory into it. To the nations of the world it is a beacon and a guide; they walk in its light. In it the kings of the earth acknowledge an authority higher than their own; they pay it homage; they bring their glory into it.

This is a splendid picture of the work and of the glory of the Universal Church, the Church which has the uncontested right to call herself Catholic. Her Catholicity is marked by a characteristic which had never marked any city which St John had

known. Her gates are open without any thought of shutting. The nations pour into the City without hindrance.

St John has given us an Ideal of the Catholic Church which is higher than any which is now realized among us. On the other hand, it does stand in harmony with some of the great facts of Christian life to-day. One in particular should be emphasized. The City of God—the Universal Church as St John saw it—is a mistress which claims the homage of the nations and in turn confers benefits upon them. The nations as nations and their rulers with them have a great part to play in the Kingdom of God.

If we ask, *How are nations to do this*, surely history, and pre-eminently the history of our own country, supplies the answer. Nations serve the Catholic and Universal Church by means of National Churches. These as parts make up the whole, as many regiments make up one army. In a truly National Church we learn the Catholic spirit, and so we are taught to confess with full understanding, *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church*.

The nations and all the gifts that each particular nation can bring are needed for the Universal City of God. But the gifts are not material gifts—not tribute, nor revenues—rather they are moral and spiritual gifts which can only be rendered by Frenchmen as Frenchmen, by Russians as Russians, by Englishmen as Englishmen. National Churches, as far as they are true to their character, gather tribute of these national virtues and national talents, and so pour them into the Treasury of the Universal Church. The fervid and yet logical piety of the

Frenchman, the mystic strength of the Russian, the plain, practical religion of the Englishman—these separate gifts are nursed by the Church of each land. Christ is well served in each of these ; it is not His pleasure to lose *one*. The great *Fact* of Nationality is to be accepted in the sphere of Religion as well as in other important spheres. God made all nations of one blood, but He made them—nations !

The spiritual capacities of Englishmen are to be drawn out for the service of the Master by the action of a National Church, a true Church of England which consists of Englishmen, understands Englishmen, and appeals to Englishmen. Through such a Church alone can the Universal Church gather the full tribute of our nation for Christ.

The Universal Church then delegates to the Church of England the duty of gathering all that is distinctly English into the service of the King of the Church. How must the English Church perform her task ? How must she foster the plain, practical religion which is to be hoped for in our countrymen ?

(1) By a great appeal to the understanding and to the affections of our fellow-countrymen. The Church of England must persuade and win Englishmen. To a certain extent it is done. It is needless to point to our Bible and Prayer Book in the Mother Tongue. But perhaps it is not as fully recognized that even before the Reformation many books of devotion were in circulation *in English*. The principle of our Church from long ago has been to sing God's *praises with understanding* and to interpret what is read from the Scriptures.

But it is useless to try to live in the past. Lan-

guage changes, meanings of words change, modes of thought change. Neither the English Bible nor the English Prayer Book can safely remain word for word as they were in past generations. It is a principle of our Church to revise, as need arises, not only her translation of the Scriptures, but also the text of her Prayer Book. Many a word in a Collect which was vivid and full of colour in the seventeenth century is *dull* if not *dead* to many of our people to-day. Again certain forms of devotion in the Prayer Book have lost much of their power of appeal, while other forms which are *not* in the Prayer Book have proved their value to meet the religious needs which are felt to-day. The Church of England must do her utmost to teach all Englishmen to pray in words which they understand, and in words which when they are understood are powerful in appeal to those who speak our tongue. Prayer Book Revision is a first need among us in order that simpler souls may not go untaught by the Church how to pray. But in addition to an official revision of the standard text of the Prayer Book, some provision must be made for elasticity in the use of the services thus revised. The amount and the kind of change in the jealously-guarded text of the Book which are likely to be generally accepted are not likely in the least to be sufficient and suitable to meet the needs of mission buildings in Lambeth or Bethnal Green, and in some of our neglected rural districts. There is a great opportunity for wise bishops and for wise clergy who will carefully consider the case of many English congregations which would hardly be reckoned Christian when judged by the more careful judgment of the Mission

Field. The Act of Uniformity is no boon to them ; they need not to be driven, but to be led gently to Prayer Book worship.

(2) And secondly, the Church of England ought to strive to make her appeal to *all* religious Englishmen. Her mission is given her by the Universal Church—or rather by the Lord of the Universal Church. Her duty is to make her appeal as wide as the Gospel of Christ. She must realize that the Church exists for men, and not men for the Church. She must be tolerant—and more than tolerant—towards differences of opinion and of practice among her members. The Church of England belongs to a race which is devoted to Freedom ; which has done service to the world in the name of Freedom ; which has been knit to the Gospel by the promise of spiritual Freedom. But Freedom presupposes many differences ; free minds will not all take the same mould ; and English minds by long enjoyment of freedom have learnt to tolerate one another's differences in secular things. The Church of England must be content to minister to free men ; she must be content to suggest and to teach where others perhaps would command and compel. If the reproach be levelled at her that she becomes all things to all men, well, that reproach was levelled at the greatest of all evangelists (St Paul).

She must listen in particular to the voice of the free men of Greater Britain. The Church of England is not confined to the English land : indeed, her strength lies largely in the vigorous branches which she has sent forth beyond the seas. The younger English peoples have “ten parts” in the Church. The claim must be allowed, and

the needs and views of Dominions and Colonies must be allowed full weight. It is due to them for the rich and varied experience which they have enjoyed, which we cannot claim at home. One very important subject may be mentioned here as an illustration. From Canada and from Australia comes a strong voice in favour of Reunion in Church fellowship among men of the same blood and of the same language. This voice is truly English. It is our national good sense which cries out that no unreal barriers shall be allowed to separate Christian from Christian. In cases in which Reunion is too difficult or at any rate premature, the claim is raised for Co-operation at least between one body and another. The Kikuyu Conference of June 1913, together with much for which it stood, has receded to the back of our minds owing to the pressure of an almost world-wide war. But *Kikuyu* must not be forgotten. The problems remain, and the English love of comprehension and toleration remains. Our Church must justify its English character by returning to the task of removing all that perpetuates avoidable causes of division.

It is, for instance, to be remembered that our Church is committed neither by her history, nor by her ordinal, nor by her formulas, to any rigid theory which forbids co-operation with non-Episcopal bodies. Rigidity is not a principle of the English Church, although it is not seldom exemplified in individual English Churchmen. We are not bound, for instance, by any principle to unchurch the Presbyterian kirk whether we meet her in Great Britain or beyond the seas. Nor ought the phrase

"Catholic Practice," so easily flung in defiance and so loosely used, keep us from all acts of help and inter-communion. To take one case only which the war has brought once more to the front with urgency. English generosity, no less than Christian charity, constrains us to lend our sacred buildings, where need exists, to other religious bodies. The fact that the English Church has never lost the ancient custom of consecrating her churches does not run counter to the charitable practice of lending churches from time to time for Presbyterian or Wesleyan worship. We do not depreciate the supreme value of the Book of Common Prayer by providing a temporary roof for those who prefer *extempore* prayer. Such action is not to be ascribed to mere careless good nature. Charity is a principle of Christianity, and *therefore* of the Church of England.

On the other hand, the Church of England must conform to the English love of order. Perhaps she has been fairly successful in answering to this condition in the past. Certainly our public worship has been orderly—even to stateliness. And this quality we certainly ought to strive to the utmost to retain. At times we are tempted to depart from it. We see some of our countrymen attracted to services conducted at white heat, when all orderliness is lost in fervour or apparent fervour. For a time, and in certain circles, such services have great success. But they can be only exceptional in the general scheme of the worship of the Church. The heart that cries out for the Living God has indeed its moments of almost childlike familiarity, but in the main it feels that worship means falling low on

our knees in humility and in awe. Most souls experience the need of guidance and of teaching how to approach the Lord of All ; the cry, *Teach us to pray*, rises again and again in the human heart, and the words which our Prayer Book gives us are felt to answer to our need.

But order in the sphere of the Christian life is a still more important matter even than order in worship. The Church of England shows those who look to her how to guide their lives. Baptism first—in infancy—at the earliest possible date, that Christ's claim upon each one of us may be acknowledged as soon as possible. With Baptism goes the appointment of sponsors, of persons who are responsible that the babe who has been baptized into Christ shall learn of Christ. And after Baptism—*Confirmation*. Those who have received Christ's blessing in unconsciousness must receive it again in full consciousness—and at the impressionable time of life—if possible, just when a general sense of responsibility is beginning to grow. The girl who is beginning to help her mother, because she realizes that the mother needs her help, the boy who is beginning to think *either* that he must earn, *or* that he must decide on some occupation which will keep him longer at his books—these are they who should be encouraged and urged to come to Confirmation. And after Confirmation then the steady regular use of the Holy Communion to keep us in mind of our need of help in the spiritual life and to furnish us with that help monthly (it may be) or weekly—the bread which the Lord Jesus still gives us in remembrance of that great day when He gave Himself once for all. And then joined with

this supreme blessing the solemn thanksgiving, the *Eucharist*, for this wonderful provision which Christ continually makes for us.

On this orderly scheme of Christian life the Church of England has hitherto insisted, and will surely continue to insist. No doubt it has been severely criticized by many Englishmen, and even by many of the deeply religious of our countrymen. But here we must face the difficulties of the situation, and decide to the best of our power between the claims of two conflicting principles—Freedom on one side, Order on the other. The State has had to face the same problem, and on the whole has dealt with it successfully. The Church need not despair. The Church must still cling to her scheme of Christian life—Baptism, Catechism, Confirmation, Holy Communion—with all her strength. But two precautions must be taken. First, the scheme must be administered in its fullness heartily by men who realize that each ordinance is a strand in a cord of love by which the Master is drawing and holding us to Himself. Here we have not bare forms, not things of the letter, but sacraments, spiritual instruments. Only make clear to Englishmen that your talk of an ordered life within the Church means this and they will cease to be hostile to it. The Church must use her order simply as a spiritual force, and she will have power with our countrymen.

But again. This order is offered; it is not imposed. Spiritual things cannot be dispensed with the rigidity with which the things of the world are sometimes administered. The Church of England must see with the eye of Christ and accept the fact that some deeply religious men will always, through

misunderstanding or through misfortune, stand outside her order. And then there comes upon the Church the Lord's command *not* to forbid the spiritual work of such men. Least of all can the English Church do it, since she is bound by all her history and by her native soil to the principle of Freedom both in Church and State.

The experience of our State may be used for the guidance of our Church. A National Church must not only teach her own people, but also *learn from them*. Just as the State is not too proud to learn, but moulds and re-makes its institutions from generation to generation as it learns from movements among its own people of the needs and capacities of its own people, so it must be with the Church of England. She has to look not only to the splendid heritage of the past, but also to the needs and opportunities of the present. She lives not for herself, but in order to present to Christ all that is best and most characteristic in the English people. Her ideal should be that of the sympathetic teacher who realizes that his pupils are growing up, and so need room and freedom. And behind all the sympathy and readiness to meet every spiritual aspiration, even if its appearance be strange, must be the firm conviction that Jesus Christ in His saving and sanctifying power is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

IV

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION AFTER THE WAR

By the Rev. J. F. BETHUNE-BAKER, D.D.

ANYONE who in the midst of a great war is invited to speak of the social reconstruction which is to follow it, can hardly avoid using the opportunity to advocate reforms in which he has himself most interest. Such a crisis in the history of the world as this through which we are passing compels us all to face problems which we usually leave to others.

In the matter of reconstruction, indeed, it might be urged that, while the issues of the war are still in many respects uncertain, it is too soon to think of it. Let us wait and see how we are placed at the end of the war and what it is that we have to reconstruct ; things will probably go on very much as before.

Yet with some of us the great fear is lest they should : lest our boys and our men should have died for their country only to keep it as it was. For many of them no doubt that aim was incentive enough—England's worth dying for—England as she is. But many, we know, thought more of the England that is to be, and hazarded their lives for the sake of ideals from the realization of which the

England that is still far off. Yet they had faith in her, and the blood with which many of them have sealed it must surely have some redemptive power for the country for which they died.

I cannot use the language that calls this war a Judgment of God on the Nations: but war is a great probation for all the peoples that engage in it; and the people that is not made better by it, that does not emerge from its searching discipline, purified, is worsted in the struggle, even if "victory" rests with it.

It is true I suppose that war itself can never be Christianized. Nor I suppose can a pulpit or a steam engine. But both may be used for beneficent ends. And war may have a Christianizing power, and in the world as it is it may be the only means by which Christian ideals can be upheld. The nation defeated in war may, indeed, have the better chance of being Christianized; for Victory may go far to destroy the soul of a people, and crushing defeat to bring it to life. Yet peace may be at least as unchristian as war;—the forty years of peace which our enemies have enjoyed were not wholly used for Christianizing ends.

When peace is again restored will they, and shall we, succeed in making it Christian?

That is the question which we have in mind when we speak of "the Church and social reconstruction." Throughout the British Empire, with only individual exceptions, in all classes and groups of men and women we have seen spring to life a spirit of readiness for service and sacrifice on behalf of the Empire and its ideals, which is in its range and intensity, I suppose, the most splendid witness to

the central idea of Christianity that the world has ever known.

People speak of men and women having been ennobled by the war. Rather, I think, they have shown in the crisis what they really are: and they have shown, whether they know it or not, how deeply, into the core of the life of our race, has penetrated the teaching of the Cross that it is in service and sacrifice that man comes to his true life.

If then we ask what part the Church is to play in that reconstruction of society which will be needed after the war, we must answer "that part which whenever she is true to her mission she always plays in the world."

As to the means which she should use, there has been in the course of her history difference of opinion and difference of practice, but I think that at no time would her most true representatives have doubted that her chief business in the world is stated in our Collect for the third Sunday in Advent—so to prepare and make ready the way of Christ, by turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that at His second coming to judge the world we may be found an acceptable people in His sight.

There we have the three great convictions by which the action of the Church in relation to Society must always be controlled:—the first the conviction that there is a divinely purposed order, to which the present order of the world does not correspond, which will at some future time be established; the second the conviction that this order, which is called the Kingdom of God, is based on eternal principles of wisdom, righteousness, and love which

were manifested in the teaching and life of Jesus Christ; and the third the conviction that the mission of the Church is to keep alive the hope of this order in the world and win men to it, so that whatever other differences divide them, the whole race of mankind may become as one people united in following out one law of life.

These three convictions express the Christian hope, the Christian ideal, the Christian duty, in relation to Society.

There have been times when the Church as a whole has seemed to lose heart and to let her convictions fade away. She has despaired of the realization of the Kingdom of God in the world and treated this life as only an education for individuals for an eternal life hereafter. That is, no doubt, a belief with which she can never dispense; a belief without which the pain of the world—the hope of young lives cut short—the frustrated endeavour—“the height that proved too high”—would be an almost unbearable anguish. But it is not a belief which tends to make the world itself a better place and the conditions of life in it more like the conditions of life in the Kingdom of God. And whenever this hope of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth has faded from the consciousness of the Church, she has compromised her ideal of social righteousness and narrowed her duty to the world, abjuring her mission of social renovation.

She has been content to accept things as they were, and it is notorious that she has so acted that to-day she is widely regarded as ranged on the side of the established order, as the Church of the well-to-do, the squire, the lady bountiful, the landlord,

the employer—as the Church of the powerful governing classes.

Yet she ought to be always trying to move forward to the goal of her faith.

“Christianity” always directs us forward, to the future, to the new order that is to be: and it does not allow us to be content to dream about it as men have dreamed of Utopias, which they never supposed to be attainable. It tells us that our very salvation depends on the measure of our success in fashioning our lives, as nearly as possible in all the circumstances of our times, according to the standards of life in the Kingdom.

Generation after generation we are born into a complex social system which is only partly Christianized, which is never stationary, but always in movement. New opportunities, new dangers, are constantly arising through the incessant flow of human activities and interests in the world as it is. Intellectual, moral, industrial economic conditions are always changing; and every change of conditions presents new problems to be solved, new material to be Christianized.

It is the duty of Christians, of the Church, to be always seeking the most Christian solution possible. It is true that the most Christian solution possible at the moment may often wear the drab garb of compromise: sometimes a bolder faith or a more sensitive conscience and a finer wisdom, more widely diffused, might have found a more Christian way: We have to take the world as it is. As we look back on the history of the Church, it is easy to be wiser than our forefathers. At least in our own time, when indeed we are at cross-roads, let us try

to take the way which tends to the Christianization of thought and life. And if we are to take it, we must face the facts of life as it is and free our minds of the unchristian idea which has constantly numbed the conscience of those of the Church's members who should be her leaders—the faithless and fatal doctrine that the order of the Kingdom of God is not the ideal for this world.

Many of those who could have done most in the past to uphold the ideals of the Kingdom in the social life of our country have been hypnotized by the unchristianized prepossessions of their class, and in large measure victims of the conventions by which the facts were concealed—the conventions of “polite society” which the Church has not disturbed. To-day we are at least half-awake. To-day the veil is drawn aside, and we must deliberately shut our eyes if we are not to see. Our very boys and girls know more of the conditions of life than men and women have known in the past. They know that underneath the fine flowers of pure and dignified service and high character is a sub-soil of impoverished and stunted lives and conditions inimical to health of body and of mind. And the best of them revolt from a social polity which, while it produces the high development of the few and the respectable level of morality and comfort of a small middle class, leaves masses of the people, by whose work and services they benefit, subject to conditions which are a disgrace even to our “civilization.”

It is the present state with which we have to deal : and in recent years many a scheme for social amelioration, by general consent regarded as good and

even urgently needed, has been abandoned because it would cost a few millions a year.

Yet the money spent in a couple of days of war would have been enough, and what we are spending in a month would have gone far to transform our slums and crowded cottages, and to give a living wage to the victims of sweated labour in town and country who are exploited not only by their immediate task-masters, but by us all. I say, exploited by us all—for in the economic conditions in which we live it is impossible for us to trace to their origin the things we buy and use, and so impossible for us to avoid becoming “partakers in other men’s sins.”

For this reason, if for no other, it is incumbent on the Christian to concern himself with “social questions.” He cannot stand aloof and disclaim responsibility for unchristian conditions on the ground that he had no hand in making them, if he is, however remotely, getting advantage from them and if he has any power to help to make them more Christian.

This is not a plea for “righteousness by legislation,” but rather for “legislation by righteousness,” for more of the spirit of Christianity in government in all its forms: and more recognition of the fact that the only moral authority which is effective in a modern state is that which is embodied in legislation. To the mass of men the Law is the standard of Right.

The business of the Church is to do all it can to secure that every child born into the world shall have throughout his life as good a chance as possible of growing to the best of which he is capable, viz.,

a full-grown man—or, in St Paul's words, of attaining to "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

And so it is the Church's business for example to take thought—according to the knowledge of the day—for the health and education of the mother and the child that the child may have life and have it abundantly. It cannot ignore these things because epileptics may be good Christians, and the dividing line between saintliness and insanity has sometimes been thin.

We know that man does not live by bread alone, and that fine character is not the creature of comfort, nor yet of the kind of education which the reformers of the seventies expected to herald the millennium. We know that clean houses don't make clean minds. And we have good reason to suspect that if the control of "capital" was in the hands of "labour," commerce would still be as much "without conscience" as it is declared to be to-day. One "class consciousness" would be replaced by another, for the material benefit, no doubt, of a larger number than before, but not directed to the interests of the community as a whole.

Just as one class consciousness is beginning to fade away—the class consciousness of the well-to-do who have been in possession of power, it is met by another new-born and rapidly acquiring strength and force, that threatens to manifest itself just as selfishly in our common life.

The suspicions that "labour" has shown in the last few months are, I believe, abundantly justified by the policy of "capital" in the past: and the cry for the "conscription of wealth" in the interests

of the State is a just demand in exchange for "conscription of men," though much less easy to bring to effect. These suspicions and this demand are the natural result of the state of civil war which has existed between "capital" and "labour" through the long years of international "peace"—a state of war that capital avows as frankly and unashamedly as labour.

Even under stress of the Nation's War and imperative necessity, it is not peace, but only an armistice, that can be arranged. If the Nation's Peace, when it comes, is to be Christianized at home, here is one great sphere for the operation of the central principle of Christian ethics that each individual person is an end in himself, not to be exploited in any one's interests,—and of its corollary that only in service to the community of which he is a member can the individual person realize himself.

It has been said that the Church cannot take sides in industrial and economic controversies. Rather it is true that whenever a moral issue is involved, the Church cannot be neutral. The Pope by his avowed neutrality in the war, and his refusal to form a judgment on the morality of Germany's treatment of Belgium, has perhaps done as good service to the world as harm to the Papacy. For like the Germans themselves he has shocked the moral conscience of mankind, and brought home to men the fact that it is the business of the Church of Christ to champion the afflicted and wronged, to resist injustice in any form, to denounce wrong-doers, to insist by all means in its power on the supremacy of the Christian moral law above

all the alleged interests of the State or any group of men.

In our social reconstruction in England after the war there will be no room for the false idea that the Church of England must be "neutral" in the rearrangements between "capital" and "labour" that will be inevitable, or in any of the settlements of questions that affect the moral welfare of the nation. It will be difficult, no doubt, as it constantly is, to establish the true proportion between rights and duties on which the Christianization of Society depends. But at least the mind of the Church and its activities must be steadfastly set against all unrighteous conditions that exist in the world, whether in trade and commerce, in domestic or international politics, or in the more personal and private relations of daily life.

And any system, or any detail of a system, that keeps one human soul in subjection to another, is unrighteous. No system is Christian in which there is schism in the body and the members do not have "the same care one for another."

We are fighting our national war against a spirit that is truly described as anti-Christian, because it denies to the soul of other nations the right to live and grow which it asserts for its own soul. It claims that right for itself alone. We can see how monstrous the claim is when it is thrust on us as it were in the bold headlines of a placard that spell out the rise or fall of the empires of the world.

But we shall not have learned the lesson of the war, or the duty of the Church of England to the people of England after the war, unless we determine to banish from our national and civic and private

life as much as possible of the Prussianism by which it is infected.

The dominance of class over class, sex over sex, employer over employee, landlord over tenant, private and personal interests over the interests of the whole community in any shape or in any sphere, —this kind of dominance is anti-Christian in essence and in its working. And, only if the Church can set itself unreservedly to eradicate this kind of dominance of one over another, only then can it lead in the great movement towards a better human society, purer and less selfish, juster and more generous, organized for righteousness and the protection of personality, which instinct as it is with the spirit of Christ, whether with or without the Church's help, is certain to be one issue of the war.

V

THEOLOGICAL REORIENTATION

By the Rev. J. KENNETH MOZLEY, B.D.

WHAT will be the effect of the war upon religion and upon theology? What developments may we expect to see when once again men and women turn to the ordinary avocations of civil life? What tendencies of thought will reveal themselves, what desires will be urgent to find expression in religious practices and devotional forms? It is to such questions as these that I would try to give some kind of an answer, for I am sure that in this matter, as in many others, we must be awake to the possibilities of the future—always ready to understand, to sympathize whenever we can, to condemn only under the pressure of loyalty to the deeper truth. And if the observer wishes not merely to recognize the signs of the times, but also to help others to sift and choose among them (for not every sign, though its blaze fill the heavens, is a beacon of hope), he must always remember how far greater than all human interpretation is the revelation which God gives, that no measuring-rod has been granted to him, whereby he may trace out the boundaries of the things of God, and confine their growth and power within limitations that his own "Thus far and no farther" sets up.

I

I would speak first of the Christian truth as expressed in the Church's doctrine and theology. Will not the importance of true thought, especially in relation to the great problem of the meaning and value of life, be more widely admitted? Not to admit it, or to put it on one side in an off-hand way as a matter of no real urgency, would mean utter blindness on our part to one of the great predisposing causes of the war, to one of the facts that have been its continual accompaniment. Let me quote from a pamphlet which has come into my hands words which will illustrate my meaning and point their own most grave moral. The writer, a Prussian by birth, but for many years a naturalized British subject, declares that "those who come into close contact with the people of Protestant Prussia, and whose knowledge of the German language enables them to get some glimpse of their real inner life and thought, are confronted with a philosophy of life which is perhaps the crassest and the most destructive form of materialism which the world has ever known, and which the mind can possibly conceive. It expresses itself in an almost complete absence of all transcendental ideals, and in entire disregard of those moral and spiritual laws and obligations which would seem to be inherent in our nature, and upon the obedience to which the healthy development of a nation's life ultimately depends." Later, he points out that the pagan development which has taken place in German national life could never have occurred "had not the truths of religion

completely lost their hold upon the individual as well as upon the nation."

Let us mark those words : " the truths of religion." Not religion simply as an emotion, as a particular kind of experience, but religion as involving beliefs about the character of the world and the meaning of life, involving, at least, those beliefs in a personal God, in the spirituality of the human soul, and a future life, which the author can regard as no longer existent in the public opinion of modern Protestant Germany. Surely we shall not fail to learn our lesson here, shall not fail to recognize as at least a stupid thing the easy sneer at dogma. A dogma may be denied, but to treat as unimportant, as valueless for life and unworthy of attention, the great and venerable dogmas of the Church is sheer mental and spiritual opaqueness. What are those dogmas?—That God is our Father, that He cared so much for men, His children, that He gave His only Son (He was never a lonely God : before He was Father of the world, before He was Father of men, He was the eternal Father of the eternal Son), gave Him to take human nature and even to die for men, that this Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord, rose again from the dead, and that through Him there descends from the Father upon men sick with many ills, and especially upon the Holy Church, of which Christ is the Head, the Holy Spirit Himself eternal with the Father and the Son, to bless human life through the sacraments of Jesus, and enrich it with supernatural grace. To disregard such things, as though they could be in no sort of touch with ordinary life, is a mark of that impatience and even contempt for anything except material

goods, which, if produced far enough, and on a large enough scale, forebodes such a national perversion as the author I have referred to draws for our amazement, and such a national disaster as we even now see in its beginnings ; and as more and more the veil of the future is being withdrawn, we catch glimpses of the approaching ruin of a great nation that once feared God but turned from Him to serve idols—and to serve them all in vain.

Is there any one point in Christian doctrine which we may hope that the war will throw into a strong light ? There is such a point, I believe,—too much neglected in past years, though indeed it is no point on the circumference, but the very centre of the circle of Christian doctrine. The Cross with its message of redemption should, for Christians, be right in the centre of their thought of God, for the Cross is not only a mighty appeal to the feelings, nor only the greatest of examples to stimulate the will,—it is the teacher to men of God's mode of action, of the way He chooses for the salvation of men, the way of weakness, of suffering, of apparent, most apparent, failure. And the challenge of the war to the troubled mind and the breaking heart is—can these horrors, this ghastly suffering, this appalling waste of young life, cohere with any doctrine of God at all with any belief that the world means intensely and means well ? I think that this question would be even more perplexing than it is were it the central doctrine of the Church that God is the kindly, sometimes almost the genial, Father. But in the gloom of the Cross we trace another message : what seemed the greatest, most miserable waste of the most heroic young life (He was only 33) was God's

method of redemption, His richest gift and His profoundest teaching. In the darkness of to-day's world, the gross darkness which covers the peoples and lies, one heavy pall, upon men and women from end to end of a suffering continent, there is hope in the concentrated, supernatural darkness of the Cross. How can we justify God before the present world? Only by recovering the Cross and its Gospel of a suffering God. If God is in Christ dying for men, then God cares. He stands above the battlefield now; but He once descended on to it and died there. Christ's obedience passed through suffering to final victory. Obedient to the call of country, millions have given themselves to-day, many of them to meet the last enemy, death, by him to be slain. Is there for them no final victory? Let those who doubt remember how others doubted when on Calvary everything was finished. Yet it was not finished as they thought, and as they were to learn. It is the same lesson that we all have to learn, to be forced back upon it, to repeat it boldly because in it alone do the world's mysteries and tragedies find a key—Christ died for our sins, He rose again the third day, He is alive for evermore.

II

Let me pass from the more theological to the more ecclesiastical side of my subject. What forces may we expect to see at work in the Church of England, what changes to be promoted by their interplay and their conflicts? There are two which, I have little doubt, will prove strong, and even

turbulent. When I speak of them as Catholicism and Interdenominationalism, I hope that my meaning is plain, even if the terms used are open to objection. Both forces will have gained in power from the long stay of our Army in France, from the close association of Englishmen of every kind of religious conviction and denominational attachment in the face of extreme danger, and from the goodwill and mutual respect created among the army chaplains. Thus I think it almost certain that the bitterness of the old suspicions and prejudices which blazed up in the so-called crisis in the Church of the beginning of this century will become more and more feeble, except in some isolated and not very influential circles. A strong desire will be felt, even a determination, that the religious practices and devotions of the Church of England shall not necessarily be confined within the four corners of the existing Book of Common Prayer. There are things which may not be liked, which ecclesiastical authority may not like, but which, only at great peril, will, in the future, be simply forbidden in the Church of England. There will be a good deal of religious and devotional experimentation which may often be dangerous, sometimes quite undesirable, but which will either have to be allowed and, as far as possible, controlled—or prohibited, with no results except the increase of anarchy and the absence of all restraint. Let me refer to two of the practices most disliked by moderate Churchmen, which will need the most careful handling, practices that must be observed at work before any scientific and final judgment can, in my opinion, be passed upon them. The

first is the Invocation of Saints, the second is the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the purposes of devotion. To condemn such practices out of hand as superstitious and unedifying seems to me both unscientific and arrogant: unscientific as being a rash judgment in advance of the collective experience available as to the value of such practices, experience which deserves to be carefully noted and sifted—arrogant as implying that, in respect of its sixteenth century opinions on these subjects, the Church of England has said the last word and has nothing to learn. And of this I am very sure—belief in the supernatural, and in its relationship to human life, is not so strong in modern England that we can afford to return nothing but a harsh and unsympathetic negative to those who wish in their devotions to realize and assert the fact that the other world is populated, even as ours is, by holy and helpful personal forces; those who, believing with all their hearts the truth of the Christmas message, Emmanuel—God with us—would worship and pray in the presence of what they believe to be a special manifestation of His abiding with His people. That such practices involve, as the condition of their possibility, a united congregation, that they should be carefully regulated and controlled, goes, I imagine, without saying, but control is one thing, and prohibition another. In so far as there is self-will, individualism and even anarchy in the Church to-day, it is largely due to the many years during which the latter policy was adopted. Even to-day one catches a murmur now and then of a threat that the time will come when within the Church of England the letter of the law—as

some account law—will prevail. Such threats are useless, and even were they successful, would have as their one result the disruption of the Church and her overthrow as the religious representative of the nation. Is it too much to hope that after the war there will be a change in our whole point of view as to policy? The method of suppression, even were it desirable, is not feasible, as the campaigners of fifteen years ago for the suppression of the Mass and the Confessional—(in some such terms the catch-phrase ran)—were to discover, though both in the Press and in Parliament they had powerful backing.

But if there is to be a tendency in the direction of a freer use of Catholic devotion, there will also be one in the direction of inter-denominational unity, towards the breaking down of barriers and a readier intercourse with Nonconformists. It is possible, though not, I think, very likely, that Kikuyus will be multiplied at home. But as we may expect a settlement of this whole question, a settlement which may not please any body of opinion to any very great extent, but may work tolerably well in practice, when the next Lambeth Conference meets, speculation is not very profitable. But this I would say: the whole question of our future relationship with Nonconformity must be very greatly affected by the success of the suggestions of the new President of the Free Church Council for the creation of a United Free Church of England, and by the lines, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, along which such an experiment proceeds. In a brilliant sermon at the recent Bradford Free Church Congress, Dr W. E. Orchard, of the King's Weigh House, pleaded

for what one may broadly call the enrichment of the Free Church Life by the restoration of certain Catholic elements and ideals, priesthood, sacramentalism and the like, but without what he considers the narrowing interpretation of these ideals, of which older Churches have been guilty. How such elements can find a place within English Nonconformity is hardly for an outsider to say. But if Christian union at home is to be brought nearer in the future—and union may be interpreted, as by Bishop Chandler, of Bloemfontein, writing in the “Constructive Quarterly,” as “the fusion of different elements into a single whole,” and contrasted with the federation which, as the same theologian says, does but “perpetuate and stereotype” our divisions—it will, I believe, be through such a sympathetic inclination on the part of Nonconformists towards the historic Catholic element in Christianity as will lead them to accept, not episcopal control—except in the broadest and most formal way possible—nor episcopal ordination of all their ministers, but the episcopal ordination of those ministers to whom their own congresses, unions, or synods entrust the administration of the sacraments. Any such concession would, I believe, be met from the Church’s side by a frank willingness on the part of all for whom the Church is primarily not a political but a spiritual institution, to open up the whole question of establishment and endowment, and to recognize without reservation the special message of Nonconformity (to use a title that would then be out of place) and the rightfulness of its special characteristics. But I am well aware that all this, even if such lines of progress seem at

all desirable, will be in advance of the times for very many years to come.

III

I have touched on only a few points in this great subject. Of much which is by no means of second-rate importance I have said nothing, in particular of the question—may we expect a powerful demand for a freer interpretation of the historic creeds, for such a revision of theology as the Roman Catholic Modernists attempted to secure? Such a demand will certainly be made, and even now meets with support which, though limited in extent, is often of high intellectual quality and indubitable moral sincerity. If a real inner breaking-point is to be reached in the Church of England, it may be on this issue. But our whole thought on this matter is still in its early stages; it will not, I think, fall to this generation or even to the next to give anything of the nature of a formal decision.

In conclusion, let us not be pessimistic. Clearer and clearer it seems to me to become that in the future, and the further into the future we gaze, the choice must be, in Western civilization and ultimately all over the world, between the Christian religion and no religion at all, between Christian truth and no truth that man can ever grasp and know. I do not rule out the possibility that the alternative which mankind in the future will choose will be the alternative that to us must seem utterly gloomy, and dooming to atrophy man's noblest powers. But in the Gospels I read a nobler hope,

the hope of a good time coming, of the best time that humanity has known or could know, while this earth and age remain and God's eternity still tarries, a time when the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

VI

THE NECESSITY OF DOGMA

By the Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, M.A.

“ **H**E that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches ” (Rev. ii. 7). It will be obvious that I am proposing to make an unusual application of these familiar words. They are generally claimed by those who may, without prejudice, be described as modernists, and sometimes by those more than modernists, those futurist sons of the morning, who, in their conviction that the night is far spent and that the day is at hand, would cast off the works of dogma, and put on, a little breathlessly, the armour of enlightenment. They are not, I think, very commonly employed to indicate the necessity of maintaining the Catholic and Apostolic Faith.

But it is part of my purpose, both now and always, to claim that liberty and Christianity are identical, that the freedom of man and the Gospel of Christ are the same thing. We pray every morning to Him Whose service is perfect freedom, and St John reminds us that our Lord said, “ Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” We attain our full stature, our perfect liberty, we become what God means us to be, only when we hear and comprehend and assimilate the truth of God.

And in order to assimilate as much as may be of the whole truth of God, we must listen not only with our own ears, but with the ears of our fathers. "O Lord, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that Thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them." Those Christians who happen at this moment, or at any moment, to be what we call alive, are only a very small part of the whole Church. We may not disfranchise the departed, and refuse to hear their evidence, simply because their experience and the record of it is earlier in date than ours. If dogma is founded upon facts, let it be founded on all the facts. If we are going to "hear the Church," let us hear the whole Church.

For what is dogma? It is the experience, digested, recorded, classified, of Christendom. It is the result of the impression made by our Lord upon His servants. It is what the friends of Christ have thought about Him.

I

There are three things that I desire to say. And the first is this. *Christian dogma is a fact. a phenomenon, that we must take into consideration.*

The great miracle of history is that Jesus, the Nazarene, has been able to project Himself forward into the world's life. His effect on human character has included the lives of persons of every imaginable kind: men and women, young and old, wise and foolish, ambassadors and children, kings and mothers, the lusty soldier and the crippled girl; a Paul, a Mary Magdalene, a Joan of Arc, a Thomas

More, a Wesley, a Dr Johnson, a Father Stanton. He has led to the production of writings so different as the Gospel of St Luke and the *Summa Theologiæ* of St Thomas Aquinas, the "Imitation" and the "Pilgrim's Progress" the "Great Charter," and the "Book of Common Prayer." And all this has been born of the conviction that "Jesus is Lord." There are many things that might be said about the weakness and sinfulness of the Church of Christ, and if any reader is thinking of some of those things now, let him believe that I would join with him in acts of penitence. But it remains a great miracle—the greater as we know more truly the frailty of the material it has had to work upon—that the organ of divine salvation, which began when God did not abhor the Virgin's womb, is still surviving. The Christian religion has apparently been destroyed time after time by the ingenuity of its opponents and by the badness of its friends, but it is still here to-day. "One Jesus, Whom Paul affirmed to be alive." Yes, and He is still alive, because a young man, Onesimus, or Francis of Assisi, or William Smith, has just been converted by His grace.

II

This dogma was an inevitable fact. You may regret it. You may wish that what you think is the simplicity of the Sermon on the Mount had never been encumbered by the metaphysics of the Nicene Creed. For my own part, I do not for a single moment agree that the Sermon on the Mount is simple in the sense of being non-theological, or that our Lord's Gospel can ever be separated from

a true belief about His right to speak it. But so far as metaphysics are concerned, as a plain person to whom metaphysics are always rather difficult, I will agree that it would have been nicer (I use a foolish word on purpose) if the amount of metaphysics could have been smaller. But it was impossible. The early Christians were entirely convinced of the fact, which is entirely true, that in religion you must use the whole of the faculties that God has given you, intellect and all. Religion is to some extent connected with the feelings, and to a much larger extent connected with the will. But the only complete description of religion is that it is an affair of the entire personality.

Remember what happened. The Church began, as you can read in the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians, verse 3, with the simple confession that "Jesus is Lord. Then came the heretics. A few of them were perhaps seekers after notoriety. A few of them were men of evil life. But the great majority of them were simply questioners, men who had hold—an exaggerated hold—on some one side of a Christian doctrine, and wanted to know whether room could be found in Christianity for the thing that they felt to be important. And the Church had to find an answer to their questions. The Church had to dig down deep into the wisdom of the Bible and the treasury of its own experience of Christ to find the answer. So came the Creeds.

It was not in the least that the Church was possessed with a lust for making definitions. The Creeds are defensive in their origin. For example, a man named Arius arose, and said that our Lord was only

to be called divine in some sense inferior to that in which the Father is divine. St Athanasius at once perceived that the whole doctrine of Redemption was at stake. For a being who is less than Very God of Very God may teach and lead and help. He may bring a message down from Heaven. *But he cannot bring divine Redemption, he cannot recreate humanity.* So Athanasius fought for the true faith, and so the famous Creed of the Council of Nicæa was made as a bulwark of the Gospel. But the thing for which Athanasius fought was not his own idea. It was not simply the private opinion of a clever man. It was the charter of Redemption for our children's children. The simple Christian of to-day, who trusts in Jesus only for salvation, owes it indeed to Jesus only that he has means of grace or hope of Heaven, but he owes it to Athanasius and those like Athanasius that the faith of Jesus has been preserved until to-day.

Or take that other Confession of our Christian Faith, which is commonly called the Creed of St Athanasius, though it has much more connection with St Augustine and the Latin-speaking Church. You perhaps do not like it. It would help a little if you realized that Morning Prayer, the service in which it occurs on thirteen occasions in the year, was never intended to be the general public service of Sunday morning, to which all manner of worshippers, instructed and uninstructed alike, should come. But it would help still more if you realized, as perhaps indeed you do, the meaning and history of the document, how every sentence of it is the actual answer to some question that actually was asked, how it bears from end to end the dints of

actual conflict, how it has as a matter of historic fact preserved the faith.

The Church cannot undo the work of the great Creed-making centuries, the fourth and fifth, any more than it can undo the Reformation, any more than Europe can deny the French Revolution, or any other organization can deny an event which has left a permanent mark upon its life. It is not only that I *ought* not as a Christian to abandon Christian dogma any more than a soldier ought to lay down his rifle. It is that as a Christian I *can* no more abandon Christian dogma than I can shake off my arms and legs.

The Church can re-interpret? Yes, of course it can. Just as Athanasius re-interpreted the faith expressed in the New Testament and loosely current in the Church of his day, so we must re-interpret the ancient Creed of Christendom and express it to the men of our own day in language that they can understand. But always we begin with what the Spirit has said to the Church. The Historic Faith lays down the lines along which our Christian thinking will go. We hold it modestly and humbly. We know that it is not—that no human language ever can be—more than an approximation to the whole truth of God. Of course all theological language is of a metaphorical character. No one supposes that “Personality” or “Fatherhood,” or any other such term, has no more meaning, no fuller and richer meaning, in the divine sphere than that with which we are familiar in the human sphere. But the human language is a sufficient approximation to the truth. No one supposes that when you have said, with Christian theologians,

that there are in Christ two Natures in One Person, you have exhausted the whole of what our Lord knows about Himself. But it is enough—and it is vital for our Christianity—to know that He is Very God and Very Man.

III

My last point is this. *Christian dogma is the analysis of Christianity, a formula which Christian men will find it easy to remember, by which Christian men will live.*

Our religion is not a religion of mere aspiration. It does not consist simply of saying “Lift up your hearts,” or “There is a good time coming,” or “Perhaps after all it will be all right.” It is a Gospel. It is *News* of something that God did. The “faithful saying” is that “Christ Jesus *came* into the world to save sinners.”

St Paul, when he was casting about for a formula which would exclude idolatry and the infection of belief in evil spirits, had no difficulty in finding what he wanted. “No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Ghost.” Only in the atmosphere of that Holy Source of all Christian life can you take the sacred formula upon your lips.

St Athanasius, when confronted by a heresy which, as Mr Balfour has pointed out in an eloquent passage of his “Foundations of Belief,” would have inflicted irremediable impoverishment upon the Christian Faith, fought strenuously and victoriously for the formula which you find in the Nicene Creed, “Very God of Very God, Of one substance with the Father, By Whom all

things were made." Without that, there is no Redemption.

We in our day are confronted by a double fact. On the one hand we find people who think they can be Christians without anything to stand on. Of course they are parasites; they are really living on the Creed of Christendom. But what they *say* is that their religion consists in going about and doing good. God forbid that I should impugn the reality of their goodness. It is the most difficult problem with which I am acquainted that a few strong souls appear to win through life without the Christian Creed. But I have not the least hesitation in saying that for very many it is only a fine weather faith, which will not help them to face the real Cross when the real Cross comes.

And on the other hand we find people, especially poor people, who are the vast majority of the population of Great Britain, who in nearly all the affairs of life are accustomed to live by formulas. "Mustn't grumble" is the dogma of the poor. Magnificently patient, but theologically quite inadequate.

What the Church has to do is to teach a few—a very few—of *the right formulas*, to make Christian dogmas what they are meant to be, the saving knowledge of the simple man. Religious education ought not to consist, as it too often does, of imparting historical and geographical information, of instruction in the dimensions of the Temple or of the distinctive tenets of the Pharisees and Sadducees. It consists of a few Christian dogmas, "Jesus is Very God of Very God," "I believe in the Holy Ghost," "Every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times a year, of which Easter to be

one," " Ye shall bring this child to the Bishop to be confirmed by him," " The things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."

We are thinking of Reconstruction, and the Church of England is preparing for a National Mission. The fundamental success of such a Mission depends of course on its effects on character. But if the Church is going to reach the people, if it is going to begin to have the desired effect on character, it must deal more largely in simple Christian formulas—the old formulas, or new ones which mean the same thing—which men can learn, and remember, and use as they go about their work.

VII

THE HUMAN CHRIST: A STUDY OF THE TEMPTATION

By the Rev. F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, M.A., D.D.

“For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.”—HEBREWS iv. 15.

IN times of doubt and foreboding, when, as never before in the experience even of the oldest among us, the words of our Lord are being daily brought home to us, our minds turn to the deepest questionings concerning religion. Whether we are conscious of it or not, we all are asking two things, What is religion? and Is it any use at all? We feel that when what we see around us is possible in a world, which has had the high ideals of Christ's example and teaching before it for centuries, there must be something wrong with Christianity. That is to say, either man has not apprehended it aright, or it is altogether a mistake. The most remarkable instance of such a frame of mind prevailing in the world is in the beginning of the fifth century, when it became evident that the Roman Empire, at any rate in the West, was in the throes of dissolution before an overwhelming wave of barbarism, when the fabric of civilization, raised by the labour of centuries, was tottering to its fall

and the entire population of what had once been flourishing countries was being swept away. Then it was that a general cry arose, that the cause of disaster was Christianity, and that to save the world it was necessary for men to abandon the faith of Jesus Christ.

The answer was found in the new idea of history embodied in Augustine's "*De Civitate Dei*," and in the consolatory ideal of the visible Church.

And so it is always: Christianity appeals in different aspects to different ages, and what satisfies one generation does not another. It would not be difficult to expand this theme, and it would be worth doing so if only to show that our faith does not rest entirely on events which happened in the past, but that its great characteristic is that in every age it supplies often unexpected answers to the difficulties of mankind.

In the present crisis we are inclined to say that Christianity has failed, because its teachers can supply no obvious answers to our difficulties: nor do I now propose to give one. But, if we may judge by what has happened in the past, it seems, to say the least, probable that some old doctrine which the Church has always held but seldom valued will be found to contain the answer we require. Such a doctrine, I suggest, may be the much ignored one of the perfect humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It has always been an unpopular doctrine because people have had a fear that those who admitted our Lord was man were trying to undermine the doctrine that He was God. Yet, as a matter of

fact, it is as great a heresy to say that Jesus Christ is not perfect man, as to maintain that He is not perfect God. The fact, however, is that we know something of what a man is, and very little of God ; and therefore, when we speak of Christ's Godhead, we lose ourselves frequently in sublime language which keeps him at a distance from us and is often meaningless ; whereas, when we talk of Him as a man, we are compelled to use intelligible terms, which seem to us to savour of irreverence. Yet we ignore one side of His nature, and especially that side which we can understand, and by which He was manifested to us. If we begin by regarding our Lord as God, we can never understand Him as man ; but, if we look first at His manhood, we can hope to realize, however dimly, the mystery of His Godhead.

The first thing about manhood is that it develops from birth. The body grows by food, the mind by experience. Jesus was no exception to this. He increased, not only in stature, as He passed from boyhood to manhood, but in wisdom. He had all the limitations of childhood, including that of ignorance. When He asked questions sitting in the temple among other students, He was a learner as well as they. He did not, with reverence be it spoken, feel qualified to begin His great work till He was about thirty years old, *i.e.* till He was a fully developed man.

Another necessary qualification of manhood is the power, to use Isaiah's words, of "refusing the Evil and choosing the Good." A man would not be a real man at all if he had no power of choice. It is hard, but not impossible, for us to imagine

a man who never under any circumstances chose the wrong course. But it is inconceivable that a man should exist and never be called upon, not merely to choose between right and wrong, but to discriminate between two courses, both of which had the appearance of being right. Now we know from Scripture that our Lord had not only to decide between right and wrong, but to endure the hardest trial of perplexity as to which two courses was really the will of God.

It is for this reason that the story of the Temptation of our Lord is one of the truest Epiphanies, in that it shows His manhood in the reality of His trials, and His Godhead in His triumph over them. About few subjects have more absurd ideas prevailed. Some have maintained that His temptations were absolutely literal ; others have explained them away by a rationalism which can only be called ridiculous. But the Evangelists can never have regarded the temptations as other than symbols of the mental agony through which our Lord passed in deciding what was to be the character of his brief work on earth. Bear in mind that, in two cases, Satan did not so much as suggest that our Lord should do anything wrong, and in the third he promised Him to surrender the world for a single and momentary acknowledgment of His power. In order to see how our Lord was tempted, let us regard Him from the purely human side and then see how He could have been tempted by Satan's suggestion.

Our Lord was a young man, conscious of great power. One of the most false of all generalizations

is, that genius is always modest. It would be far nearer the truth to say that it never is. In fact, no one, as I should imagine, suffers more than a youth possessed of great gifts, especially if he resembles our Lord in being absolutely selfless in his aims. Such a man, full of energy, burning to serve mankind, and seeing with a true prophetic eye how he can do so, finds that everything seems against him. His circumstances are narrow, he finds no sphere of action, his seniors reprove, his friends laugh at him. Do what he will he cannot get a hearing; he sees affairs confused by experienced incompetents, he is left alone whilst the crowd run after men he knows to be impostors; fettered, cribbed, confined, as he is, opportunity never seems to come and he eats his heart out in despair. Only one thing seems possible. He must somehow attract attention and thereby get a hearing.

Was our Lord tried thus? We know not; but we do know that three great alternatives were presented to him in his temptation, all leading up to the same idea.

It is usual, I believe, to explain the first temptation as being an incentive to Jesus to use His divine powers to satisfy His own needs. But surely there is a deeper meaning in the "Command these stones," etc. One of the Messianic prophecies was that the wilderness and the solitary place should rejoice at His coming.

Was not therefore the suggestion made that He should turn the desert into fruitful cornfields, create abundance where there was waste and give food to the world? Let men see that the new

teacher could and would feed them, and they would flock to Him ; and, when He had removed from them all worldly cares, He could instruct them as He would ! I cannot but think that the answer implies this. God had led His people into the desert for a special purpose, to teach them, amid all His hardships and privations, the Great Truth that Man shall not live by bread alone ; therefore our Lord refused to win them to Him by satisfying their bodily needs.

Then there is the vision of the exceeding high mountain and the view of all the kingdoms, as St Luke says, "in a moment of time." If Jesus would not buy the people with bread, let Him try a surer way by becoming the ruler of the world, and with the supreme power in His hands force mankind to live in peace and happiness. The experiment was actually being tried at the time. The will of a single individual representing the majesty of Rome was being imposed on the world ; and on the whole it was making for human happiness. The Roman provinces as our Lord knew these were better governed than those countries had been before, and whatever may have been the sins of the Emperor Tiberius he at least laboured to improve their administration on humane and even beneficent lines. And yet, to One endowed with divine wisdom, what a piteous failure all Rome had done must have appeared. Why should not He grasp the sceptre of the world, rule as Messianic king in perfect righteousness, and diffuse happiness on every side. Satan seemed ready to yield without a struggle, and man, whom Jesus loved, could under His rule

be happy on earth. But he saw that this was not God's will.

The third and most insidious of all the temptations remained. It was to compel men to recognize His power and right to speak to their conscience by a sign. We should say by a religious revival. Appeal by descending from above the adoration of God's people. In a few days the news would have spread throughout the world that the Messiah had come and that Jesus was He. No one would deny Him then : all would obey ; and His teaching would soon pervade the world. Why tarry when one sign would convert mankind and open its eyes to the truth ?

If you will consider for a moment that, to this day, those who belong to no church, and are opposed to the whole Christian scheme, are prepared to say that Jesus was the most wonderful figure in history ; and often add that they themselves are not Christians, because none who call themselves so have tried to follow His example, you must admit that one so gifted with the power of wisdom as our Lord could have done any or all these things and thus have compelled the world to acknowledge Him. That He did not is a proof to me, at least, that His wisdom was not human but divine. For to every temptation resisted by Him the wisest of mankind have yielded. The Church, for example, has grasped at every single thing which Christ refused ; and, perhaps, for this reason, we are to-day deploring her failure, whilst still honouring her Master.

Satan has often enough taken her up into the high mountain of pride and shown her the kingdoms of the earth. Has she ever refused his offer ? When

Constantine became her patron and men invented the story of his donation of Italy to the Papal See? When Theodosius offered Edicts to crush paganism and heresy? When Charles knelt at St Peter's altar to receive the crown of empire? In the great days of the Papacy? Wherever she held political power, hedged in by privileged and fenced by penal laws, has the Church ever refused to avail herself of the opportunity to make her dictates binding upon the world? Never has any Christian body declined worldly dominion; and every time churchmen have shown the abysmal depth of human folly by their exercise of it. The Master shows His divine wisdom by recognizing that, as Saviour of the world, these adventitious supports were no aid to true religion. And, when Satan has whispered, Command these stones to be made bread, has the Church turned a deaf ear? Have the clergy of any Christian community ever refused to be almoners of the bounty of the rich? Did not the monastery, the cathedral, the bishop's palace glory in the crowds of mendicants waiting to receive their doles? And is our organized charity much better? Is it really a matter for congratulation that bishops and teachers are chosen, rather because they are capable administrators, than spiritual men; and that many clergy cannot give an answer concerning the hope that is in them, because they are so busy with serving tables that they have (unlike the apostles) to leave the word of God." Perhaps the "efficiency" of the Church is its greatest drawback; and it is human wisdom to make stones bread, and divine wisdom to refuse the suggestion to do so.

Again, has the Church ever failed to see the advantage of a popular revival of religion? From the days when vigils at the tombs of martyrs were found to stimulate faith, and pilgrimages discovered to be useful in exciting the religious emotion, to the times of missions and revivals, the same story has been told with wearisome reiteration. And have not these stimulants to zeal and noisy manifestations of devotion been ever unaccompanied by evils at least as great as the good they caused? I confess I often feel that the distrust of what our ancestors called enthusiasm was really a manly protest against these violent attempts to increase devotion. And, after all, it was this which our Lord refused when He stood on the buttress of the Temple and did not cast Himself down.

We are hoping for these very things now. After this war is over, we are told, in England at least, the opportunity of the Church will come. And what do we look for? Some of us expect the Church to force peace upon earth and to prohibit war, to make the nations beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and set up international tribunals, and refuse to trade with armed nations. But we, perhaps, forget that one of the noblest-minded of the popes tried it in the eleventh century, and caused untold misery and war by his efforts after universal peace. Others hope that the Church will direct her energies to social reform and make everybody religious by diffusing comfort on every side—by filling people with bread and promoting such respectability as will make the religion of the Cross so easy that all will embrace it. A third section of the religious world

hope that a revival judiciously engineered by those in authority will fill our churches ; and all will be well again as it was in those "days of faith," which may come in the future, but certainly have never existed in the past.

All these may be right ; but if they are, it will be assuredly a proof that the religion of Christ is at an end ; for His methods will have been proved failures, and what He chose will have been abandoned.

But if His is, even the perfection of even man's wisdom, let alone God's, we must follow His method. He did not appear to claim the gratitude of the world as the great Public Benefactor, the Ruler of the Nations, the Prophet and Restorer of the True Religion. His means are slower, but the surer for that reason. He revealed Himself to the world as man. He submitted to all man's limitations, He attracted a few followers, He made many enemies. He grew up, lived, suffered, was tempted, experienced what to the world appeared to be failure, He endured the fire of temptation. He died as man. But the more human His career appears to be, the more divine it actually was. For His methods were not those of human wisdom, but really divine as being analogous to all we know of God's work in the universe. That, as we can perceive, takes no count of time but proceeds as though for eternity, not aiming at "results," but making men discover spiritual truth, as they do the laws of Nature, by the long teaching of experience. Still have we to learn the lessons from the human Jesus, and until we have done so we do not realize the true significance of His appearance, life, and

death in the world: nor shall we, till we have grasped this, realize the meaning of words which we now repeat glibly, as though they were not the greatest of all mysteries, namely, that Jesus Christ is God.

VIII

THE SIGN OF JONAH : AN INTERPRETATION AND ITS MESSAGE

By the Rev. F. CONQUEST CLARE, M.A.

“The sign of Jonah the prophet.”—St MATT. xii. 39

IT has been the wisdom of the Church of England, while asserting and requiring a belief in the inspiration of Holy Scripture, carefully to avoid an exact definition of what she means by inspiration. At crises such as the Colenso controversy of the last century the temptation to define has been strong. Most happily that temptation has been resisted, deliberately and firmly.

The result of this policy is that, while the *fact* of biblical inspiration is maintained to-day not less strongly than before, those who are concerned in such matters—and which of us is not concerned?—are free to approach any particular inquiry unfettered by a hard and fast statement as to what, precisely, inspiration is—as to how it came, or what it has produced. We are at liberty to face facts and to exercise our judgment.

I have a twofold motive in asking that we may use this one liberty in considering the story of Jonah. Firstly, by reason of our Lord's allusion to it, the difficulty of the story has got entangled

with the cardinal fact and dogma of His Resurrection, and then secondly, I believe that, rightly interpreted, the Book of Jonah bears intimately upon the needs and the perplexities of the present time.

I

There are few sections of the Old Testament which are more associated with Bible difficulties than is this story of Jonah the Prophet. To the popular mind the story is a grotesque absurdity, and the contempt in which it is held is unfortunately only heightened by some of the arguments urged in its favour. No one is likely to be much impressed by the old story—is it a fable?—of one who said that, provided he read it in the Bible, he could believe with equal facility that the sea-monster swallowed Jonah or that the converse process took place. Neither are we likely to be convinced by the argument of a certain “evangelist” of our own time, that the monster in question must have been specially created for the reception of the prophet. The Bible sometimes does need saving from its friends.

The worst of it is that the disrepute into which this story has been brought by foes of Christianity and friends alike does not stop with the story itself. It is, even now, honestly believed by some, that Christianity itself must stand or fall with the literal truth of the Jonah story. There are thoughtful people, also, who cannot make their whole-hearted acceptance of the Christian Faith square with the literal interpretation of *Jonah* which that Faith

seems to them to demand, with the deplorable consequences that either their conscience or their Christian belief suffers.

The clergy, too, are implicated. By many they are believed to have stretched their intellectual honesty to the breaking-point in order to make the necessary declarations at the time of ordination.

It is worth while, therefore, to make some attempt to unravel the problem which the Book of Jonah presents.

The view now advanced is that this book neither is nor was intended to be the record of a miracle at all, but that it is a parable.

Just as, in the equally well-known story of Balaam,¹ there is a considerable symbolical element—the speaking of the ass representing, not an articulate utterance but the inward voice of an awakened conscience—so the Book of Jonah is symbolical.

It is symbolical. It is also didactic. It is one of the most striking missionary tracts ever written.²

The Book comes to us from the time following the Exile. The missionary zeal, which among the Jews had shown signs of development under the prophets, had well-nigh vanished before a rigid and bitter intolerance: when the Jews thought of their neighbours it was to pray for their speedy destruction. *Jonah* is a strong and brilliant protest against this attitude.

Mankind as a whole was the object of God's

¹ Numbers xxii.

² For the argument of the remainder of this section the writer is greatly indebted to C. F. Kent's "History of the Jewish People," vol. i, §§ 250-252.

love, and not the Jewish race only: this truth, obvious to us Christians, was seen by the unknown author of *Jonah* alone of the men of his time, so completely was the real mission of the Jewish race lost to view.

What was the author's method?

He seems to have adopted as the vehicle of his message to his own time a popular story connected with the historical Jonah, the prophet, the son of Amittai, who flourished in the reign of Jeroboam II.¹ What this story was we shall never know, but *a* story of the real Jonah was probably ready to hand, and familiar to Hebrew readers.

Another figure, equally familiar, was also employed. To Eastern peoples a mythical sea-monster represented the world-powers which preyed upon weaker nations, and especially upon Israel.

So in *Isaiah* we read: ²

In that day the Lord shall punish leviathan the swift serpent, and leviathan the crooked serpent; and He shall slay the dragon that is in the sea.

Like our Lord Himself, the greatest Teacher, the writer of the Book of Jonah recast common-place elements into the form of a parable with a profound spiritual meaning.

The meaning of the parable of Jonah is not far to seek.

Jonah is the type of the narrow, post-exilic Judaism. He would do anything rather than preach to the enemies of his race. His fear was that the Ninevites *would* listen to his warning.

¹ 2 Kings xiv. 25.

² xxvii. 1.

He knew that, if they repented, God would not destroy them. The Jewish race, like Jonah, stood in an unique relation to Jehovah. Like him, they contrasted unfavourably with the heathen who served, faithfully enough, the gods they thought they knew.

Jonah turned from God and sought refuge on the troubled sea. This, to a Jew, would suggest the mad perversity of his forefathers, who tried to evade God's commands and embarked on the perilous sea of Oriental politics.

A great fish rose out of the sea to devour and, in God's Providence, to preserve His servant. This would at once recall the experiences of God's people in Babylon; in fact, another prophet of the Exile had already employed the same figure in reference to the fate of his people. So in Jeremiah we read ¹:

Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon hath devoured me, he hath crushed me . . . he hath swallowed me up like a dragon, *he hath cast me out.*

Later in the same chapter ² Jehovah replies:

I will do judgment upon Bel ³ in Babylon, and I will bring forth out of his mouth that which he hath swallowed . . . My people, go ye out of the midst of her.

It is, then, fairly obvious that in the Book of Jonah we have a close parallel to the thought and imagery of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and both the writer of the book and the readers for whom it was

¹ li. 34.

² vv. 44, 45.

³ Probably this means *Baal*.

intended would have been very much surprised if they had been asked to take the parable as though it were history. They can hardly have failed to understand its message—that God is more loving than His own people made Him out to be: that God will pardon all, whatever their nationality may be, who crave His mercy: that the Hebrew race was trained to proclaim God's will to the nations, the Exile being but a phase in their education to this end. They would recognize also the warning, that those who disobey bring down judgment on themselves.

II

We are not at the end of our inquiry. Our Lord Himself had something to say about Jonah.

Even assuming the probability of the parabolic interpretation of the book, taken by itself, are we not shut up to a literal view by our Lord's own words in St Matthew.¹

As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Is it possible, it may be asked, that our Lord should have misled us on such a point as this?

At first sight it does look as though we had either to accept the Jonah story literally on our Lord's authority, or to deny that authority itself.

On three different lines of thought, however, our minds can escape from the apparent dilemma.

¹ xii. 40.

(1) Our Lord was a Teacher, and like all true teachers He adapted Himself, in things indifferent, to the standpoint of the learner.

It may have been so here.

If a preacher went for an illustration to some English classic such as "Hamlet," "The Pilgrim's Progress," or "John Inglesant," no sane person would imagine that he pledged himself to a literal view of those books as history. So it is at least possible that our Lord alluded to the story of Jonah simply to illustrate His coming Resurrection without committing Himself or His Church to any view of the book beyond that.

(2) Our Lord was truly man, and, as man, He was subject to human limitations. In matters of ordinary human information—in matters, that is, apart from the particular divine revelation He came to give—His standard of knowledge was that of the educated Jew of His own class and time.¹ So, on this line of thought, even if our Lord did think of the Jonah story as literal history, we should not be obliged to take that view any more than we feel bound to deny our certain knowledge of the solar system because on one occasion our Lord spoke of the rising of the sun.²

On either of these grounds we could maintain our belief in Christianity, that is, in our Lord Himself, and at the same time refuse to believe that Jonah

¹ It is well known that the commentators of our Lord's time interpreted the Old Testament after a fashion which seems to us amazingly literal and unscientific, and often far removed from the spirit in which the Old Testament Scriptures were written. It is therefore tolerably certain that the early teaching our Lord received included a literal conception of the story of Jonah.

² St Matthew v. 45.

the Prophet was actually swallowed by a sea-monster, and that after three whole days spent in literary activity of a high order¹ he came forth unhurt.

(3) There is, however, a third explanation revealed by a careful study of our Lord's actual words.

When we compare our Lord's words as recorded by St Matthew with the parallel record of St Luke,² we find that St Matthew alone contains the crucial words :

for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

St Luke simply reads :

for as Jonah was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation.

St Luke goes on to report our Lord as saying that "the men of Nineveh repented *at the preaching of Jonah*," not that Jonah exercised any influence upon them by the wonderful experiences he had passed through. My own suggestion, therefore, is that St Luke rather than St Matthew gives the true record of what our Lord actually said, and this position is reinforced by the extreme difficulty of reconciling the three days and three nights of Jonah with the one day and two nights during which our Lord's Body rested in the tomb.

St Luke and St Matthew cannot both be right,³ and it is most probable that St Matthew has only done

¹ Cf. Jonah ii. 1-9.

² xi. 29 ff.

in this case what he did in so many other places in his gospel, namely, alter the tradition of our Lord's teaching as it reached him in order to make the fulfilments of Old Testament type and prophecy as close and as detailed as possible.

Oddly, enough, St Matthew himself confirms this view. Referring once more to chapter xii. we see that in verse 41 he, along with St Luke, makes our Lord say that the men of Nineveh repented *at the preaching of Jonah*.

On these grounds it is submitted that the reference to the three days and the three nights attributed to our Lord is an elaboration of St Matthew's own.¹

I advance this third view as my own. There is truth in the premisses of the first two explanations, although for myself I do not think that they contain the solution of the actual difficulty before us. One thing, however, is certain. Whichever explanation of the three may be the true one, we are free, so far as St Matthew is concerned, to adopt without reserve the view that the Book of Jonah is not history but a parable with a missionary purpose.

Judah clung to privilege, but neglected responsibility. That course must end in disaster, disgraceful and overwhelming.

III

“The sign of Jonah the Prophet!” The sign was twofold, both for the first readers of that wonder-

¹ To the student it is interesting to see that Dr Alfred Plummer has come round to this view. Compare his notes on the parallel passages in St Luke and St Matthew in his Commentaries on those Gospels, his “St Matthew” being the more recent.

ful little book and for the Jews of our Lord's own time. At both periods the Jews were warned that repentance was due, and that their privilege involved a world-wide duty.

Originally the message of Jonah lay in the written parable. The second time the message was vocal, in the preaching of the Baptist and the teaching of our Lord.

As Nineveh repented at the call of Jonah, however unwillingly given, so should Judah have repented at the call of the Baptist—so should it repent at the call of our Lord Himself. A Greater than Jonah was there !

As Jonah preached to the Ninevites, a Jew preaching to Gentiles, so should the ruling classes in the Judæa of our Lord's own day have welcomed the preaching of the Gospel to the poor and its extension to the Gentile world.

Both calls were disregarded, and, after nearly nineteen centuries in company with St Paul¹ we are still dimly hoping for the riches that will be when that great loss has been repaired.

Both calls are heard to-day. A Greater than Jonah is speaking now. To-day the call comes to Nation and Church and individual to repent and turn to the Lord with full purpose and hope of amendment. It is the message of Lent: it is the message of the war. It were sad if the men of Nineveh put us to shame.

Again, the missionary call is not less insistent than before. May we take warning from the men of Judah who heeded not their warning and crucified their Lord !

¹ Romans xi. 12.

The only justification for empire is that it may be the instrument for the extension of the Kingdom of God in the widest sense of that term. As a Church our preaching and our faith are dead and fruitless if we seek not to extend to others those blessings which we have received in trust. As individuals we must realize our share in this national and religious responsibility. We may be little people, but we are little people in two big worlds, and we share both their dignity and their duties. Let us live up to our position and to the demands of our time! In the words of Frederick Denison Maurice, let us remember that "The Kingdom of Heaven is not for those who would shut it up, but for those who would open it, as the Apostles did, to all kindreds and tongues and tribes."¹

"Imperial means beneficent
And strength to service vowed."

¹ Quoted in C. F. G. Masterman's "F. D. Maurice," p. 227.

IX

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EVANGELICAL SPIRIT

By the Rev. J. R. S. TAYLOR, M.A.

THESE familiar words of St Paul—"I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth"—are not chosen as an ornamental prefix, they are no mere pious irrelevancy; they have an intimate connexion with the subject before us—"The Church of England and the Evangelical Spirit."

The word "Evangelical" will recall to most minds the memory of that great movement of the eighteenth century which awoke the Church of England to a new life, or it may suggest that school of thought within the Church which has inherited the traditions of the great Revival. But the Evangelical Spirit did not originate in the eighteenth century: it has been in the Church from the beginning: nay, it may be traced further back yet. It is the very spirit of the prophets who sought to remove the emphasis in religion from the externals of worship to the attitude of the heart, who strove to train the people not in the due observance of ceremonies, but in right ideas of God. Upon St Paul pre-eminently the mantle of the Prophets fell. And yet there was a difference. For the Incarnation

means nothing less than a Revolution : all history takes a fresh start from Christ : He " makes all things new."

So it was a new evangel that the apostles proclaimed. Christ was their gospel, the supreme revelation of the Father. Endued with His Spirit, and devoted to His cause they went forth to carry the torch of the gospel into the thickest darkness of heathenism ; and the fire which was kindled in the earliest days of Christianity has never died out. The Evangelical Spirit has been a permanent heritage in the Church. At times indeed it has smouldered low, and might almost seem to have been quenched.

In our own Church, it burned brightly in the days of the early Celtic missions : it gleamed forth again in the age of the Friars and of Wycliffe : it broke out strongly at the Reformation and again burst into fervent flame with the preaching of Wesley and Whitfield. And from their days the work has been handed on in constant succession by that school of thought which is known as Evangelical.

But, I take it, it is not our present aim to trace the history of a party, but rather to examine the spirit of Evangelicalism and to inquire into its principles.

Now, at the outset, it seems necessary to clear the ground by two negations.

In the first place, Evangelicalism is not the same thing as Low Churchmanship. Historically the name " Low Churchman " has quite a distinct origin, dating back to the beginning of the eighteenth century, when it was applied to the fox-hunting parsons who paid much attention to their social

connexions and as little as possible to their ecclesiastical duties. Unfortunately the two types have become confused in the minds of many people, and Evangelicalism has suffered from the association. But essentially there is no connexion between Evangelicalism and slovenliness; on the contrary, any student of the Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century cannot fail to be struck by the fact that its leaders were strict to obey the rules of the Prayer Book, and did a great deal to re-establish decency and order in the conduct of public worship.

In the second place, Evangelicalism is not synonymous with a merely negative Protestantism. Though from time to time Evangelical Churchmen have been driven into controversy and have opposed doctrines and practices which seemed to be contrary to the teaching of the Apostles and to the principles of the Reformation settlement, yet they have never altogether forgotten that their vocation is to preach a positive evangel, that it is not the presence of ceremonial or its absence that is of vital importance, that it is not circumcision that "availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation."

So properly Evangelicalism stands for the proclamation of a positive evangel.

But, it may be urged, is not this true of the whole Church of Christ? Yes, indeed, all Christians are called to be witnesses, to be salt and light in the world. Yet there are certain aspects of the truth, which it has been the special contribution of Evangelicals to emphasize: and to these we must now turn our attention, and ask, what are the characteristic notes of Evangelicalism?

Now, I believe that we find them summarized, or at least adumbrated, in the words of St Paul quoted at the head of this article which indeed form the keynote of the whole Epistle to the Romans, the thesis which St Paul works out in the following chapter—"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." And, notice that the correspondence which we shall seek to trace between the Apostle's teaching and the tenets of Evangelicalism is no accidental or arbitrary coincidence: there is a direct and fundamental relationship. For it was the reading of Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans that led to the conversion of John Wesley and so was the means of bringing about the great Revival.

In the first place, St Paul says that he is not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the "*Power of God*," that is to say, its power lies in its divine origin: it is not a means of salvation devised by man, it is the "gospel of the *grace* of God." Now this is exactly the point that Evangelicalism is constantly bringing to the front, that salvation is not man's achievement, but God's free gift: man is impotent to do or to be what God wills in his own strength, he must look away from himself and receive in faith what God offers.

The presentation of this truth is not, of course, confined to one section of the Church alone: it is constantly being borne witness to in the sacraments and proclaimed by men of very different types in the Church: but for all that, it remains true that the emphasis upon this fundamental doctrine of Christianity is eminently characteristic of the Evan-

gelical spirit. Witness only the typical hymns of the Revival—

“Other refuge have I none,
Hangs my helpless soul on Thee” . . .
“All my trust on Thee is stayed,
All my help from Thee I bring.”

or again—

“Not the labours of my hands
Can fulfil Thy law’s demands.”
“Nothing in my hand I bring.
Simply to Thy Cross I cling.”

Now,—to turn for a short space to a side issue,—this emphasis laid on Grace has led to two doctrines which have sometimes been exaggerated or misunderstood. On the one hand, it has tended to produce Calvinism or at least Augustinianism: it has made some men lose sight of the necessity of co-operation on man’s part.

Consequently among Evangelicals there have been those who have adopted a rigid theory of election: but this is not to be regarded as a characteristic of the whole body, for it has found as many opponents as champions.

The other doctrine which, when rightly understood, is seen to be vitally associated with the doctrine of grace, is more truly typical of Evangelicalism: it is the doctrine of Assurance, which has often been regarded as the fruit of presumption and self-confidence, whereas in reality it has sprung from the desire to focus the attention not on man at all, but on God’s almighty power. It is born of a grand confidence that “if God be for us” nought can be against us; “He that spared not

His own Son but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him freely give us all things? "He which hath begun a good work in you, will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ."

Then St Paul goes on, "the gospel is the Power of God *unto salvation*." The free gift of God is salvation: the burden of the gospel is man's deliverance, it is good news for a lost world. Jesus Christ came "to seek and to save that which was lost." Hence it is characteristic of Evangelicalism to regard Christianity primarily as a religion of Redemption. Therefore the atonement occupies the central position. "Calvary is the only spot from which a true view of Sinai and Bethlehem and Olivet can be obtained." This belief in the Cross as the culmination of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ we may take as the second of the characteristic marks of Evangelicalism. It was the very kernel of the preaching of John Wesley: it was the secret of the philanthropic fervour of Wilberforce and Shaftesbury: it is the fountain-head of the missionary Society to-day. "The love of Christ constraineth us because we thus judge that One died for all." This point was emphasized recently by one of the Church newspapers. "Perhaps, above all," it said, "we have to thank the Evangelical movement for the prominence which its sure grasp of the fundamental truths has led it to give to the cause of Foreign Missionary work. Of course, the Evangelicals have not been alone in this: but they have for many years past realized the primacy and urgency of this claim as no other section of the Church, taken as a whole, has done." ¹

¹ "The Challenge," January 16, 1916.

And so St Paul continues—the gospel is “the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.” And here, I believe, the apostle brings out not only the universal application of the gospel, but also the terms of its application. It is to “*every one that believeth.*” If a man come in the right attitude of faith he may have “boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus.” That privilege is no longer limited to the High-priest. Because of the finished work of Christ, the way is open and free: “we may, we must draw near.”

And here we find the third, and perhaps the chiefest, characteristic mark of Evangelicalism, in the assertion of the right of direct access of every individual to God through Jesus Christ. “There is one mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus”—and no other. This truth Evangelicals have stoutly maintained, in spite of all opposition. In the worship of God, they put no stress on *place*—men can meet with God in the market-place or by the river-side no less than in the sanctuary: they put no stress on *ceremony*—no ritual form must be required as a *sine qua non*: they put no stress on *priest*—there is no need of any human mediator. Do not mistake my meaning. Ministry, sanctuary, and ceremony are necessary to order, but they are not necessary to salvation. Good and helpful as they are indeed, if they serve their purpose, they are not essential *as between God and man*. For every one direct access to God is available through our Lord Jesus Christ. Because of Him, confession of sin is made to God direct, forgiveness is ready to hand, the presence of God is immediate.

It is as Brother Lawrence found when he wrote "The time of business does not with me differ from the time of prayer: and in the noise and clatter of my kitchen, while several persons are at the same time calling for different things, I possess God in as great tranquillity as if I were upon my knees at the blessed Sacrament." The monk did not on that account neglect the Sacrament: neither does the wise Evangelical. But he did not limit the operation of the Spirit of God to that means of grace. Whether it be in the trenches or in the jungles of Africa,

"Spirit with spirit can meet;
Closer is He than breathing,
Nearer than hands and feet."

Here then are the characteristic notes of Evangelicalism—Christianity and religion of Redemption, salvation the free gift of God, access to God direct. What a message! Truly we can say with St Paul, we are "not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." It is powerful: it is a dynamic force: its value then can be appraised.

What is the verdict of experience. "By their fruits," said our Lord, "ye shall know them." Let the history of the great Revival bear witness. Here is a tale to thrill and to inspire. Read of the awakening of spiritual life, that changed the face of England—two or three thousand people listening to John Wesley preaching in the open-air at five o'clock on an October morning, the churches crowded to overflowing, aristocrats and pitmen alike forsaking a sinful life for one of godliness. Read of the revival

of organized Church life under those early Evangelicals, who introduced daily services, and early celebrations, who were the first to adopt Sunday Schools, and all that has come to be recognized as the necessary machinery of a well-worked parish. Read of Champneys of Whitechapel, called the "pioneer of the modern type of parochial organization," or of Grimshaw, whose country church could scarcely hold its thousand communicants. Or again, read of the social and philanthropic work that was set on foot under their influence—prison visitation, the reform of mad-houses, the abolition of the slave-trade. Recall only the names of Wilberforce, of Buxton and of Shaftesbury.

And what of to-day? is this the glory of the past alone? has the work of these leaders been accomplished? Some tell us that it has, that their message has been assimilated by the Church of England as a whole. But is this the case? In reply, we need only point to the large body in our Church—larger now than ever before—who are proud to consider themselves the heirs and trustees of the early Evangelicals. These would rejoice, indeed, if it were true that the principles of their father had been assimilated by the Church and if the spirit of Evangelicalism permeated the whole. They do not remain members of the Church merely to push the interests of a party. They are loyal, satisfied members of the Church of England, Catholic, Protestant, and Reformed: they are convinced that all the essential elements of true spiritual religion are to be found within their beloved Church. But they believe that they still have a

witness to bear, a deposit to guard, a message to pass on, delivered them by their fathers.

And so we face the future without fear. The crisis through which we are passing is putting all things to the test, tearing away conventionalities and revealing born reality. But we are glad rather than anxious. We speak of reconstruction, and in some form it is bound to come; but the Gospel needs no reconstruction. Doubtless we shall interpret and apply it in new and more living ways, but the fundamentals must remain. And the question may well be asked, Dare we meet the difficulties of the present time and the problems that crowd upon us unless we take our stand upon these three great truths?—the truth that before and behind everything lies the grace of God, that from eternity He “so loved that He gave,” the truth that this gift of God is redemptive, that it is able to save the world from its pride and selfishness and cruelty, and the truth that God’s grace is ready to hand, made accessible to all in Jesus Christ our Lord.

X

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE RENEWAL OF SPIRITUAL LIFE

By the Rev. A. H. F. BOUGHEY, M.A.

“ The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.”—
GEN. i. 2.

ONE of the commonest remarks which we hear every day, is that after the present war is ended, everything in England will be changed. Few people venture to dissent from the assertion ; and yet it is only partially true, and, what is worse, only superficially true. Some things no doubt will be changed, and greatly changed ; but these will be mainly external things, the outward forms and conditions of society, which are more widely noticed because they are more easily seen. To any one who looks beneath the surface, and really thinks, it is clear that many things will remain unaltered, and those the deepest. First and foremost, the *passions* of men will be the same : love and hate, greed and generosity, selfishness and self-denial, pride and humility, lust of power and of pleasure, will still sway the world. The *result* of their working will be changed, but they will still work. And in the main the *habits* also of men will be much the same. Not even the greatest worldly cataclysms really affect these. As in the days of

Noah or of Lot (so our Lord Himself warned us), it will be until his final coming: "They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage . . . they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded:" so shall it go on; who can gainsay it? And further, the great eternal *laws* which rule the universe, which are given of God and cannot be broken, will be untouched. The destruction of an army, the downfall of a nation, the shattering of an empire, can no more affect them than the rising of an airship or the diving of a submarine can change the law of gravity. And, further yet, the eternal *power* which is behind the laws,—that power which framed the worlds, and ever upholds them, and gave the dominion over this globe into the hand of man,—that power knows no variableness, neither shadow of turning, it is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

Must we not expect, then, that after the war, while the outward conditions of life will be vastly changed, the inner passions and desires will remain much as they are? The deeper current of life will flow on, with probably just this difference, that there will be more intensity and eagerness. The troubling of the waters, the stirring of hearts, the increased activity which a gigantic war has forced upon us, will not at once die down. Old movements, I take it, will be pressed once more with new and increased vigour; and old temptations will return with new impulse of attack. One temptation seems to me possible, probable, nay, *certain* to come: the temptation to a *greater worship of material force*. How far that worship brought about the present war I leave to others to

decide. I fear above all things that, after the war, it will return with tenfold strength. Nations which are victorious will be tempted to believe that superiority of material power brought them success. Nations defeated will be led to think that if they had only had more of that power they would have triumphed. All will be eager to increase their material resources. And victors and vanquished alike will be only too ready to make up for the months and years of peril and hardship and suffering and loss which the war has entailed, by turning to material comforts, and deeming peace to be valueless unless it brings more material enjoyment.

This is the danger which every thoughtful person cannot fail to discern. What is the safeguard? I can see but one: it is the power of the Spirit. Material force, acting on the hearts and passions of men, will prevail, unless it is met and beaten back by spiritual force. The hope for our country—for any country—in the difficult, perilous time to come, the hope for our Church, the hope for each member of it, lies in a renewal of spiritual life.

I am using the word "spiritual" in its true and proper sense. It is unfortunately common to find it used nowadays with a much lower meaning, as embracing the mind, the intellect, the temper, the disposition, even the fancy and imagination, of men. Against this degraded use I would earnestly protest. "Spirit" is being of a different order from any human faculty: in its perfection, it is the being of God Himself, for "God is Spirit." And the spirit of man is nothing less than a part of the divine nature bestowed upon him—bestowed

first, I believe, in that great primal Sabbath when, after six days of material creation, God on the seventh day "finished His work," not by a further creative act, but by a gift—the gift of His Spirit.

From that hour there has been a spiritual life of men. And on that spiritual life depends all that men do of good or of ill. If men oppose the Holy Spirit and reject His guidance, they become the slaves of evil; for God's Spirit can be quenched, and will not always strive with man. If they yield themselves to His influence, He will lead them into all that is good.

To the renewal of spiritual life, then, (who can doubt it?) we of the Church of England must look for deliverance from the dangers which threaten, and more than threaten, whatever nation or society is allured to material tendencies and desires. Humbly, but resolutely and ceaselessly, we must pray that, in the days to come, the work of the Holy Spirit may be renewed and increased,—done in us and through us and by us, but done in His great might. That prayer is above all things the duty of the Church in the present and in the future.

And what *is* that work of the Spirit for which we look and hope and implore? I think I cannot do better than go back in thought to the earliest mention of His work, recorded in the opening verses of the Bible. It was the bringing into order of what was shapeless and confused. There lay the misty waters, dark and dead. No wind was there to lash into waves their motionless calm. But the Spirit of God, mighty and withal gentle, moved softly over them, and breathed into them the vibration of light, the pulsation of life. All was

formless and void, until His presence came. Thereafter followed the successive stages of the world's creation ; till in the end " God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good."

Such was the first action of the Divine Spirit in our world. It was, as you see, *the introduction of order*, which is " Heaven's first law " ; a development, an evolution—call it what you will—but forget not that it was the action, not of blind material forces, but of the higher power which alone had produced, which alone could control.

Is it not a lesson for all time ? There is much now as there was then. Darkness, disorder, desolation are states not unknown to us. We have only to lift up our eyes to neighbour-lands to see these conditions now, in all their savage horror. And is there not a sense, profoundly true, in which we may and must expect to see in our own midst these survivals of ancient chaos ? The misty clouds of worldliness, the over-spreading floods of evil, are only too fatal a fact which we cannot escape and with which we shall have to deal. When the restraining, and in some ways purifying, influence of a great struggle is removed ; when the need for self-denial in a national cause ceases ; when the lurid light of war dies down in a dim dawn of peace—then will come our worst and severest trial. Woe to us then if the spiritual life of the Church and her members cannot overcome the strangling materialism of the world.

But it can ! Look back in faith to the world's first framing. Darkness there, and deadness, and utter depression ; but the heavenly Light burst forth at God's bidding, " and the darkness overcame

it not." The Spirit of God, which moved and hovered then—the Spirit which we have received and for more of which it is our high privilege to pray—can still breathe upon us from above; and His breath is the life of men.

XI

THE NEED OF A NEW IDEAL OF PREACHING

By the Rev. ARTHUR J. TAIT, D.D.

I THINK that we must all confess to the consciousness of a large measure of failure on the part of the Church. Some of us have been compelled to face the fact as we have never faced it before, through being confronted with the aloofness from sacramental religion, and the alarming ignorance of the elements of our faith, exhibited by so many of the soldiers to whom we have tried to minister. But this consciousness must not be allowed to depress us: rather should we regard it as the first step to revival, for it carries with it a readiness to see mistakes, to think things out afresh, and to change, if need be, our ideas and ideals.

Now while it is doubtless true that no single explanation will account for the failure to which we have referred, yet I am prepared to believe that a great number of people will concur in assigning a considerable measure of the responsibility to us clergy, particularly in respect of the use which we make of the pulpit, and of our attitude towards the ministry of the Word. St Paul was able to point to his preaching as a proof of God's love and care for the people to whom he ministered, because it was

accompanied by power and the Holy Ghost, and resulted in spiritual miracles of transformation and recreation (1 Thess. i. 4, 5, 9, 10). Why? What was the secret of his success? In so far as the responsibility lay with him, it was due to the fact that he preached with the consciousness that he had been entrusted with the good news of God. Because of that consciousness his preaching was the fearless, sincere, purposeful, and persistent proclamation of revealed Truth, or as he himself styles it, "The word of God which worketh in you that believe!" (1 Thess. ii. 1-13).

To how many of our pulpits could such a statement be truly applied? How often the preaching of us clergy is purposeless in character, and consequently poor in quality and barren in result. Putting on one side the obvious tragedies of clerical failure, where the lip gives the lie to the preaching, we have still to reckon with a great mass of pulpit ministry in which there is no personality behind the utterance, no suggestion of any desire or expectation of being used for the re-creation or renovation of minds and hearts, no indication of any consciousness of the possession of a revelation of God, which constitutes a prophet's burden that can only be thrown off by utterance. "The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy" (Amos iii. 8). What would the prophet Amos say of much of the preaching to-day? "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you that ye also may have fellowship with us. . . . These things write we unto you that our joy may be fulfilled" (1 John i. 3, 4). Do St John's yearning to impart conviction and experience, and to complete

his own joy in doing so, represent the characteristic note of us clergy to-day? "We thank God without ceasing that when ye received from us the word of the message of God, ye accepted it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which also worketh in you that believe" (1 Thess. ii. 13). Can we preachers to-day share in that confident thanksgiving of St Paul?

This is not an attack on the use of a manuscript in the pulpit: if men can move, inspire, edify us through their writings, there should be no difficulty about a preacher doing the same, who has the advantage of adding personal utterance to his written words. But there is all the difference between a cold, lifeless, heartless, detached reading of an "essay," which has no apparent relation to personality, and the communication of the very flesh and blood of the preacher, through utterance which is the expression of conviction and experience, accompanied by the true emotion which they involve. I think it is generally true to fact to say that, where there is lifeless utterance, there is very little in the content of the sermon which could appropriately be spoken of as "The Gospel of God" (*cf.* 1 Thess. ii, 2, 4, 8, 9), or "the good news of the glory of Christ who is the image of God" (2 Cor. iv. 4). And this is the chief indictment which has to be brought against the modern pulpit: it is too often used for anything and everything except the main thing for which it exists, the preaching of the Gospel.

Fortunately for religion the ministry of the Gospel in public worship is not dependent on the pulpit alone. In addition to the reading of the New Testament, there is the witness of the Lord's Supper,

with its constant testimony to the atoning death and glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ; there is the witness of the Creeds and the Prayer Book, securing the language of worship from being at the mercy of the individual minister; and there is the witness of hymns, through the singing of which we are able to edify one another (Col. iii. 16): no one can eliminate the Gospel comfort from "Rock of Ages," or the Gospel appeal from "Art thou weary," or the Gospel challenge from "Fight the good fight," or the Gospel warning from "A few more years shall roll." Through these means there has been a perpetual proclamation of the Gospel, and presentation of the Saviour, and reminder of the truths by which we live. No pulpit failure on the part of the priest can rob us of these witnesses to the content of the Gospel of God, or deprive us of these instruments of its effectual working.

At the same time we must, I think, admit that, if the Church is to rise to the opportunity which is now presented to her, one of the first necessities is that the clergy shall get a new ideal of preaching: a new ideal which consists of something much more fundamental than improvement in the art and technique of pulpit utterance. What is needed is a re-discovery of the function of the Word in the ministry of grace. The old Three-decker, standing in its central position, undoubtedly encouraged a defective conception of worship: on the other hand, it symbolized a basic truth concerning the work of grace, which is determined by two fundamental laws of our moral being. One of these laws is that the heart holds the key of the life. Our Lord gave expression to it in the words, "From within,

out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness " (St Mark vii. 21 f.). This law must be recognized as governing religion as much as every other department of our life and experience. We have the Lord's own testimony to this, when he summed up religion in the one word LOVE, " Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength " (St Mark xii. 30) ; and in His repeated use of the same word to describe the essential relation of His disciple to Himself, " If a man love Me " (St John xiv. 15, 21, 23, 24, 25). St John similarly identifies love and life because life is union with God, and " God is love " (1 St John iii. 14, iv. 7 ff.)

" Wouldst thou the life of souls discern ?
Nor human wisdom nor divine
Helps thee by aught beside to learn :
Love is life's only sign."

And here comes in the second fundamental law of our moral being, namely, that the mind holds the key of the heart. For knowledge is essential to love, ignorance is fatal. It is only through the mind that there is any access to the heart. " Where your treasure is (that is to say, the thing that you set your mind upon) there will your heart be also." This law was also recognized by the Lord when He defined the life eternal as the knowledge of God and of Himself (St John xvii. 3) : a knowledge assuredly not of mere mental apprehension, but involving a heart relationship ; and yet

depending essentially on mental apprehension for its existence.

Now what does this mean but that the basic condition for the operation of sanctifying grace is knowledge of the Lord ; and that the basic instruments for communication and reception are the Word of God (the revelation of Him, no matter how it comes) and faith, whereby He is apprehended by the mind and accepted with the heart ? For grace is not a kind of detached commodity resident in space, independent of personality, communicated by ordinances after the manner in which electricity is communicated by a wire ; but it is the personal operation of the Holy Spirit upon personal beings ; and consequently the mode of operation is determined by the laws which govern us as spiritual beings. The Sacramental ordinances of religion are true and special means of grace to us, not because virtue is in some kind of unique manner connected with the physical elements, but because they are special means whereby the body can come to the assistance of heart and mind. The Sacraments apart from the Word could never produce or maintain life : if you were to baptize a person and give him regularly the sacred elements of the Lord's Supper, but were to withhold from him the Word or the knowledge of the Lord, no spiritual life could result. Why ? Because you would be ignoring the fundamental condition for energizing the activities of the heart, viz. knowledge.

Space forbids the expansion of this interesting and important point, or the entrance upon any discussion of Sacramental doctrine ; it must suffice to say in closing that the new life, viewed as an

experience (and not in its institutional or ecclesiastical expression) depends essentially both for its beginning and for its maintenance, not upon ordinances, but upon knowledge of the Lord. Ordinances are valuable and necessary helps, but necessary with a necessity which is not absolute; the only absolute necessity is the knowledge which includes faith.

But while I confidently rely on the facts of life, as also upon the New Testament, as the evidence upon which this assertion is based, I have to admit that many of us clergy appear to believe and to teach something quite different. The dominating clerical conception of normal means for the communication of grace seems to leave little, if any, place for the Word as the basic instrument. It is, I believe, to this fact that a great deal of our pulpit failure is to be attributed. And it is for the re-examination of the whole question of the mutual relation of the Word and the Sacraments that I appeal, as my contribution to the discussion about the needs and demands of the day in which we live (*cf.* St Matt. xiii. 19 ff.; St John xvii. 17; Acts x. 44; Rom. x. 9 ff.; 1 Cor. iv. 15; Gal. iii. 2; 1 Thess. i. 5 ff.; St James i. 18; 1 St Peter i. 23 ff.).

"We would see Jesus" is the cry of the world to-day, as it was of the Greek of old. Whether articulate or the unconscious pleading of circumstances, that appeal must be answered. Let the pulpits of our land give their proper contribution to the response to this appeal, and we may expect to see a new era of spiritual power and progress.

As a practical final word, I would say to the

laity, make a better use of the Bible for the daily feeding of your souls. Remember that it is as you grow in the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ that you will also grow in grace and peace (2 Pet. 1, 2).

XII

THE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITHIN THE COLLEGES

By the Rev. THE MASTER OF CORPUS

THE Church of England has been put by Providence into a very strong and very responsible position as regards college life. Most of the colleges were founded by churchmen for the training of candidates for the priesthood or for their instruction in Canon law or for the perpetuation of certain definite Catholic points of teaching. My own college had a peculiarly interesting origin, in that it was the work of the townspeople of Cambridge, who were members of the two guilds of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin, who combined together to erect a college where men might be trained up in academical learning and fitted for offering prayers to God for the soul of every one of the members of the guilds as he departed out of this life. The colleges and *pari passu* the University are the children of the Church, and this fact has been duly recognized by Parliament and Commissions. Nothing has ever been done to diminish, in any way, the right of the Church to exercise her ministry within the walls of the colleges. The Universities Tests Act of 1871 did more than recognize the Church's right ; it went further by way of reminding

the Church of her obligation: "The governing body of every college subsisting at the time of the passing of this Act in any of the said universities shall provide sufficient religious instruction to all members thereof in *statu pupillari* belonging to the Established Church."

How have the authorities in the past fulfilled this obligation? Up to their lights they did so to the very letter of the law. The common experience of those who have been undergraduates any time from fifteen to thirty years ago will support the truthfulness of the statement of the case. Religious instruction was duly provided; whether it was the right kind of instruction may be questioned: but it was provided, and, more than that, it had to be accepted: there was no choice in the matter, for religion was reduced to a mere matter of discipline, and in practice no distinction was drawn between attendance at a lecture and attendance at divine service, except that the penalty for absence from the latter was probably more severe than for the former. There was this further vicious fault in the system, that the advices were provided irrespective of the wishes of those for whom they were provided. The governing bodies of the colleges seldom recognized that times had changed since they were young, and even if some of the younger Fellows attempted to secure some reform in the way of shortening and brightening the services, or of securing more frequent opportunities of communion, it often happened that the Master or the Visitor possessed some statutory right which made all their efforts unavailing. The fact that you can bring a horse to the water, but cannot

because of that, make him drink was seldom realized.

During the last ten years a great change has come over the situation. Deans of colleges have taken the matter into their own hands and have tacitly allowed the system of compulsion to go by default, so much so that in some cases the system has been definitely abrogated by a resolution of the governing body, and, when this has not yet been done from a feeling of hesitation, it has been recognized that the spiritual officer of the college must bear his own responsibility.

To a man with the true pastoral spirit this change has been a great blessing and a great opportunity. Under the old system, with its Draconian scale of punishments, to interview a defaulter was in most cases a waste of time and a positive injury to both sides. It was impossible to get out of the difficulty by taking no notice of abstentions, for the indignation of the undergraduate who went away under sentence was nothing compared to the indignation of the man whose offence was ignored, since undergraduates are quick to notice any failure of duty on the part of those set over them. But with all thought of the interview being punitive departed, the situation was considerably improved for the Dean, and let us hope also for the undergraduate. The latter found himself treated no longer as a cog in the wheel of machinery which had got out of place and needed force to be put in place again; he found himself instead, to be treated as the possessor of a soul for which Christ had died, and that a minister of Christ was pleading with him not to starve that soul, but to feed it on

the bread of heaven. The Dean found himself to be no more a disciplinary officer, hedged around with a vicious tradition of pains and penalties ; he was restored to his functions as a priest of the Church, with proper pastoral duties to perform ; the college had become his parish and he the *persona* of it. That, roughly, is the position which we had reached when the war broke out, but very little had been done by way of experiment on the new lines. But it may be said with some degree of accuracy that the system of compulsion had been abandoned, not so much because it had proved a failure, as because it had come to be recognized as a mistake. And in its place we had set up the spiritual influence of the individual priest : force was to be superseded by attraction ; and this involved a much greater responsibility upon the governing body in the selection of the *persona* of the collegiate parish ; any one, however learned, can carry out the tabulated tariff of a scale of pains and penalties ; but it needs more than learning to win the souls of undergraduates : it requires a man, who can add to learning piety, and to piety the saving grace of humour and common sense.

The whole tendency of Church life during the last twenty years has been to emphasize the democratic character of it. The term is one that has been much abused, and an apology may be due for using it in this connection, but it adequately represents the basis upon which a college chapel should be managed. Under the old system the governing bodies largely catered for themselves, and decided that what suited them must suit their pupils. In an ordinary parish a priest who pleases himself without

regard to the feelings or wishes of his parishioners, usually ends in driving them away : the most successfully worked parishes are those where the laity are regularly consulted and where there is a properly constituted Church Council which the priest consults ; to feel that one's people are supporting one is half the battle of ministerial life. The Church becomes to the parishioners " our Church."

The first thing that we need to encourage in our men is this corporate loyalty to their own chapel. In many college buildings the most prominent architectural feature is the chapel building : we want to transfer that structural prominence to the life of the college. And we shall only do that by letting men feel that it belongs to them as much as to the Master and Fellows, and that they have as much to say as their elders in what the services shall be and how they shall be conducted. And in passing I would urge that the chapel should be open at all times for their use : in some colleges this rule prevails ; and the men can be seen going in at odd times during the day and using the quiet of God's house for communion with Him ; but there are others where you seldom find the chapel open outside service hours. No vested interests of porters or chapel clerks ought to be allowed to stand in the way of the open chapel.

We want them to give the undergraduate full representation in the management of his own chapel. We want to make as much of him as we can in the conduct of the services ; he likes to be asked to serve the priest at communion ; he will gladly undertake the vesting of the altar in the proper hangings : my experience is that he will

do anything that is asked of him, and will get together a congregation at the shortest notice. The more you ask of him, the more he is ready to do. But you have to make him feel first that the chapel is really his ; otherwise, you will find him going off to some parish church, where he thinks that he feels more at home. He is, of course, not justified in doing so ; he is thereby guilty of a religious selfishness in thinking that there is only his own soul to be considered ; he has to consider the souls of all the members of the college ; he is but part of a corporate whole, and he breaks the solidarity of college life by consulting his own individual wishes to the detriment of the college unity. And he will continue to do this, if he can say that the chapel services represent not the wishes and views of the corporate whole, but only the orders of the governing body. The chapel is not his, but theirs.

There will, no doubt, be difficulties to be overcome in carrying out in practice such a scheme as this. A college, as a rule, will contain men of every possible shade of opinion as regards teaching and ritual, and those in authority will have to be careful not to exercise undue influence in any direction as regards ritual—teaching and preaching are quite a different matter—there we must maintain our freedom to teach what we believe, or otherwise we are useless. It is my experience that a chapel congregation is one of the most attentive to be found ; the men listen and like to hear what is said from conviction, and like it perhaps all the more when they can disagree with it and argue the case afterwards. But in ritual I have never felt

that it was right to consider one's own desires. If a service is conducted with reverence, a man can read into it all the ritual that he likes for himself.

The one service upon which one has to concentrate one's energies is the Holy Communion, and the early Sunday celebration is the real test of the strength of Church life in a college: we must keep it as simple in character as will appeal to all shades of opinion; and we must help men to come to it, by preparation services with instruction. It is sometimes appalling to discover how ignorant men are of the structure and meaning of the service itself, and short courses of talks upon the history and the phraseology of the Office are of the greatest possible help to men. We ought always to mark the season of Lent by a special weekly service with a course of instruction. No parish priest neglects such an opportunity and we must not; men like to come to such special services as men, and not as undergraduates, and the dispensation from wearing a gown helps them to realize that they are doing something which is not official but purely personal. But the chief part of our work must be, as I said, the early Sunday Communion, and, as attendances are not marked, it makes it all the more individual if the priest takes his opportunity of speaking to communicants who are irregular. It may perhaps be advisable to have a second celebration of a more ornate character; the experiment is being tried in some colleges and we shall watch with interest what results it may have.

In conclusion, I would say that the opportunities of the Church in college life depend almost entirely

upon the personality of the responsible officer, and the responsibility of the choice lies heavy upon governing bodies. He must be a man of sympathy and easily accessible ; it means in practice the giving up of most of one's evenings. Undergraduates are not, as a rule, very communicative after their first week in Cambridge : one often gets out of a man at his first interview more than he will ever tell again ; if he plucks up courage to call some evening and finds his Dean looking tired or busy or unresponsive, he will probably never come again. So that a man must never be repulsed or allowed to go away with the feeling that he has been a nuisance : if he is repelled, the influence that might have been exerted can never again be brought to bear. It is in these informal visits that the real pastoral work is done, and many a man has been brought back into the right path or led to offer himself for confirmation by a quiet talk. In short, it is not the system that matters so much as the man who works it.

XIII

THE CHANGED RELATIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION: PEACE AFTER WARFARE

By the Rev. T. G. BONNEY, Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S.

THE Archbishop of York, when preaching at Sheffield during a meeting of the British Association in 1910, thus referred to the long-standing conflict between religion and science; a conflict which, he said, had been exceptionally conspicuous in the middle of the nineteenth century. "But of late years . . . another spirit had been working, and though those who might be called the camp-followers of science and religion are apt to break out into quarrels . . . the truest and best men on either side are conscious that there is a call for truce—a truce of God, a truce to adjust misunderstandings, to retreat from rash and hasty claims, to think out their own positions more clearly, and to understand the positions of those who seemed to differ from them with greater sympathy."¹ It was a noble aspiration, and the realizing of it has, I trust, been brought nearer by that awful crisis in the history of our nation, through which we are now passing.

But why were science and religion ever at war? There seems, at first sight, no valid ground for a

¹ Printed in "The Guardian," Sept. 9, 1910.

contest, because of the wide difference between their methods and fields of work. Science arrives at its conclusions by inductive reasoning from careful observations: religion, as expressed in dogmatic statements, by deductive reasoning from information, which has been, or is supposed to have been, revealed. Thus the sphere of science is that which we can discover for ourselves; the sphere of religion that which is not thus discoverable. But in practice the two often overlap. There is a borderland in their provinces, on which each has rights, like those of nations on the high seas. Hence it is always possible for either to advance indefensible claims, and disputes to arise, which are really groundless.

It must, however, be admitted that the champions of religion have too often been the aggressors, or, at any rate, have defended a popular belief, the accuracy of which has been impugned on scientific grounds, with weapons drawn from a theological armoury. The form of the earth may serve as an instance. Nineteen centuries ago people generally believed it to be a disc, with the ocean flowing round its margin. When doubts on this matter began to be expressed, fathers of the Church defended the popular notion with texts drawn from the Old Testament, some even going so far as to express doubts whether a man could be saved who believed in the rotundity of the earth. So persistently was the old error defended by churchmen, that they did not abandon it till about four centuries ago, some time after circumnavigation had proved the world to be a globe.

Astronomers fared no better than geographers.

The authors of the Old Testament shared the popular, and very natural, belief that the sun went round the earth. When Kopernik, about the year 1543, proved this to be erroneous, the authorities of the Roman Church denounced his book and all who accepted his arguments. They persecuted Galileo and Kepler, the latter only three centuries ago, and the leaders of the Reformation were not less loud in their outcry.

Students of chemistry and physics ran the risk of being charged with sorcery, while those of anatomy and medicine fared no better. Tertullian denounced surgery, Augustine the practice of dissection for the discovery of disease. In later times Popes forbade clergy and monks, the only educated class of those days, to practise medicine, and even excluded books on that subject from the libraries of convents. Early in the eighteenth century inoculation for smallpox was condemned by theologians of the Sorbonne and by Protestants in England, and more recently—not a hundred and twenty years ago—Jenner's discovery of the protective effect of vaccination was denounced as bidding defiance to Heaven itself—even to the will of God. Nay, within the memory of some still living, the use of anæsthetics received a similar welcome in pulpit after pulpit. This last effort, however, to arrest scientific progress by religious prejudice soon died of its own absurdity.

The conflicts of religion and science as to the history of the earth and its living tenants are so recent that some still survive who took part in the war. Geologists were denounced because they found it impossible, after careful study of the Great

Stone Book of Nature, to accept the opening chapters of Genesis as literal history. Charles Darwin's noted work on the Origin of Species, published in 1859, was vituperated, from pulpit and platform, in tracts and newspapers, for maintaining that plants and animals, whether living or extinct, have been the result of gradual change instead of special creation. Yet now evolution is recognized, in a far wider field than that of biology and geology, as God's mode of working in the world of matter and of life. Yet it is only fifty-two years since an attempt was made by the leaders of the two great parties in the Church of England to force its members to declare war against science by committing themselves to the statement that their Church maintained, "without reserve or qualification, the inspiration and Divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures, as not only containing, but being, the Word of God." ¹

This brief summary of the warfare of science and religion shows that, however unwelcome the conclusion may be to the representation of the latter, they have generally been proved to be in the wrong, and have, throughout, assumed an authority to which they had no rightful claim, for they did not possess the knowledge which alone could enable them to pronounce a decision. Neither personal piety, nor any ecclesiastical position can supply the place of that knowledge which comes from a study of the subject. The opinion of the most expert maker of microscopes would be worthless on a question in astronomy, or that of an eminent mathematician

¹ From a document, often called The Oxford Declaration, circulated among the clergy early in 1864.

on the meaning of a difficult passage in the Hebrew Bible. As the old saying goes, there is no royal road to learning, yet those who supposed themselves to be champions of religion have acted as if they believed that membership of a church brought with it knowledge of things other than spiritual.¹

I do not say that the faults have been all on one side. Students of science have sometimes trespassed on the province of religion and have even rivalled the dogmatism of their opponents. But they have done it less frequently and with more excuse. It is but human nature to retort upon the assaults of ignorance and prejudice and to repel an aggression by an invasion. We must also admit that, in past time, some students of science have perverted to evil ends their knowledge of alchemy and medicine, and others, in later years, have proclaimed an aggressive agnosticism or declared that nothing can be true which cannot be tested in a laboratory. But we may claim that, in most cases, knowledge with a belief in religion has been on one side, on the other belief without knowledge. There is another difference, not to the credit of the latter party. Students of science may make mistakes, even in their own field of work, but these are frankly acknowledged when the error is discovered. That, too often, is not the practice of the champions of religion. Instead of confessing themselves to have

¹ The past conflicts of the representatives of religion and of science are described in greater detail by Dr. A. D. White (then Principal of Cornell University) in his valuable book, "The Warfare of Science." My copy is the second edition (1877), but a much enlarged one has since been published. See also "The Present Relations of Religion and Science" (by myself), chapter vii.

been wrong, they quietly abandon a position when it proves to be untenable, and retreat upon another, which has also in its turn to be evacuated, and yet continue to maintain the aspect of infallibility. It may be good generalship, but is it honest? Does it not look like caring less for truth than for the interests of a party?

The root of the evil, at least to a large extent, is the failure to recognize that a process of evolution is at work in religion no less than in the realm of nature and in all human institutions. But evolution implies a progress by an absorption of the new and an elimination of the old and outworn; it means growth, not merely by increase of size, but by development of the constituent organisms that they may better respond to the calls which are made upon them. The Apostle's words, "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things," should be no less true of a state or of a church than of an individual. In the last case no one would dispute them; we should ridicule the man who took delight in the games of his childhood, but we do not so readily accept them in that of a state, perhaps because the development is measured by decades or even generations rather than by years, so that the ruling party is slow to recognize that the laws and customs which may have been suitable for a past age may cease to be so, or may even be harmful in the present one. But if this be true in politics, it is still more so in religion. It may, however, be urged that the latter rests on a revelation, with which we must not tamper and which we cannot hope to improve. Here,

however, we must always remember that a revelation is very rarely proclaimed by the trumpet not of Sinai, but is conveyed through some human instrument. Thoughtful men recognize more clearly the significance of a truth or the tendency of the Divine guidance; they become more capable of widening the scope of a commandment, of converting a limited precept into a general principle. The Old Testament teaches this lesson; "line upon line, here a little and there a little." Its earlier books reflect the crude ideas of the Mosaic dispensation. The mechanical efficacy of sacrifices, suited to a people still liable to be perverted by heathen neighbours, gradually gives way to the certainty that a broken and contrite heart is the sacrifice really acceptable to God. The advance was but slow. The nation, again and again, even up to the fall of Jerusalem, turned aside to idolatry and the worship of false gods. To most of them Jehovah was hardly more than a tribal deity; not till the days of the captivity did they grasp the great truth that there was no other God than one, and that a graven image was no better than a block of stone or wood, not worthy of reverence even as a symbol of some aspect of the Divine power.

This is not surprising, for the spirit of idolatry still lingers in more than one branch of the Christian Church. But in it also an evolution is perceptible, notwithstanding the long and often successful struggle of the spirit of Judaism. Slowly, but surely, many social evils, which once passed almost unnoticed, have been recognized. For instance, Christian nations not only tolerated but actually defended slavery as an institution; they allowed

the high-born or the rich to oppress the poor, and even now, if we substitute a majority for an autocrat, many, especially, professional politicians, care more whether a measure will be popular than whether it is just or right.

But to such tendencies, atavistic as they would be called in science, its spirit is hostile, and that is why its students have been persecuted by those who supposed themselves to be defenders of religion. But these had begun to recognize their mistake even before Europe was convulsed by the present war. What, we may well ask, will be its effects in those happier days when God has once more given us the blessings of peace? Shall we find that religious bickerings, as will too probably be the case with political, have only been stilled for a time by the sense of a common peril, or will this war have done much to change a truce into a lasting peace.

I hope, indeed expect, that it will be the latter, for at least three reasons. This is one. War, as perhaps nothing else can do, brings us face to face with realities. The efforts for self-preservation, the life-and-death struggle, whether of men or of nations, scatter conventions to the winds and prove with irrefutable logic that deeds are more potent than words, and phrases, without an adequate backing of facts, are as futile now as they were in the days of the Scribe and the Pharisee. In the time of peace, professional politicians and well-meaning sentimentalists had persuaded the populace to shut its eyes to unpleasant facts and to stop its ears to the warnings of those who could read the signs of the times. With the first shot fired the cloud-castle, built up with the resolutions

of delegates and the votes of those who believed the millennium had begun, tumbled down in ruin, like the walls of Jericho, and left its ill-prepared inmates face to face with an enemy inspired by the primitive passions of rapine and murder.

A second reason is that war, while emphasizing the necessity of discipline and the distinctions between those who can lead and those who must be led, has broken down, among those fighting for a common cause, such conventional distinctions as have no better foundation than the accident of birth or the inheritance of wealth. To share hardships and face dangers is the strongest bond of union, and I believe it will be long before those who have fought side by side in the trenches or encountered the perils of the sea will distract or despise one another as was often done in the wantonness which was a fungoid growth of peace and prosperity. If anything can make our nation dwell in unity at home, it will be this war, which may teach us the possibility of differing without bitterness on religious no less than on political questions.

The third reason is that war has shown that no little unity underlay apparently wide divisions. Not only have the aristocrat and the democrat fought side by side on the battle-field, but also religious discords have been minimized as they never were before. The ministers of different Christian bodies—Anglican, Nonconformist, even Roman Catholic, generally the most rigid and exclusive in his definition of a church, have joined in prayer, have afforded opportunities for worship, have recognized that their differences were slight compared with their unity in love for Christ and a desire to extend

His Kingdom. In the hour of danger, in the time of suffering, in the shadow of death, men are drawn together by the sense of a common cause, a common loyalty to one Master, be this as patriots or as Christians.

The war, I say, has done much to heal our unhappy divisions, but will they break out again at home when there is once more peace abroad? Let us hope, let us pray, that they will not. In everyday life to have been associated in work for some common cause draws together political opponents and softens asperities by showing them that their differences very frequently relate, not to the end which is sought, but to the way of reaching it. So also in disputes about questions in religion. Though it may sometimes be necessary to resist teaching which limits the mercies of God, virtually denies His love towards man, or insists on the vital importance of forms and ceremonies—to resist it, as Paul did Peter at Antioch, because it would substitute the bondage of the Law for the liberty of Christ; yet while so resisting, while Protestant against error, however insidious, we must never forget that we are servants of one Master, brethren in Christ. It is for us, members of the Church of England, which in former days too often took the lead in the exclusion of others, frankly to confess past mistakes, and endeavour to win back those sundered from us by recognizing that they also are fellow-soldiers in the army of Christ, and by admitting that, while we hold our own to be “the more excellent way,” we do not assert it to be the only one across the wilderness of life to the Heavenly City.

This war will not obliterate real distinctions between man and man—distinctions of education, intellect, and disposition—but it should lead—God grant it will lead—to a better understanding between class and class, between Churchman and Nonconformist, between all sorts and conditions of men.

I began by quoting words spoken by the Archbishop of York, more than five years ago; let me conclude with some others which are about as many weeks old: "Two years ago we seemed within measurable distance of civil war, the last word of an educated democracy. After fifty years of education, drink was slaying its thousands and lust its tens of thousands; the authority of the home was going to pieces; young men and women were gaining a reputation for a very dangerous kind of impudence and levity. We had come to an end of our boasted nineteenth-century civilization. We must begin to rebuild the life of the English people. In England to-day we saw abroad a spirit of fellowship, of sacrifice and self-discipline, sure signs of the redemption and rebuilding to come." ¹

¹ "Guardian," March 2, 1916 (at Burnley).

XIV

THE CHURCH IN ITS CORPORATE CAPACITY

By the Rev. A. H. M'NEILE, D.D.

"Because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."—ST JOHN XV. 19.

CHRISTIANS are met again to watch the moving events in the drama of Holy Week. The first scene is laid on a road near Jerusalem, where the chief Actor, meek and sitting upon an ass, rides up the slope of Olivet, and the people shout Hosanna! The scene contains a note of subtle irony: the crowd, who spread out their clothes and strewed branches in the way, thought that it was a real triumph, while the chief Actor knew, and we the spectators know, that the real triumph was still to come, born out of suffering. It was only a prelude, a parable, a symbol of a heavenly and spiritual triumph.

And the drama is repeating itself to-day. We are fighting in the cause of righteousness, and we mean to win. And when peace is signed, and Britain and her Allies dictate the terms, the hurrahs of triumph will be an echo of the Hosannas on the road from Bethany. And the irony of the situation will be that millions will think of it as a real triumph, because they will see some chivalry, honour, mercy,

and good faith making a triumphant entry into Europe, Asia, and Africa. But Christ knows that it will not be the real triumph of His cause, but only a prelude, a parable, a symbol of it. His real triumph is to come, born out of long ages of man's spiritual crucifixion with Him. Victory in this war will be only the preface to a new volume of history. And it is that volume that we are now preparing ourselves to write.

So we ask—After the war, how is the Church of Christ to advance His cause? And the answer is that the Church must be crucified with Him that it may be also glorified with Him. Before Christ could be the first-fruits of them that slept, He was, like first-fruits, offered in sacrifice. And they that are Christ's must follow in the same path. But what sign is there as yet that His Church, as a body, is following in the steps of His passion? "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you." "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." *Does it?* He was despised and rejected of men; He was the scorn of men and the outcast of the people. He was buffeted, and spitted on, and scourged, and tormented, and killed. Where is the Church, as a body, to be found on all the road from Gethsemane to Calvary? Christ will not be believed on in the world until the world can see in the Church, which is His Body, the print of the nails. In plain language, if the Church is to do the work of Christ, it must be more sharply distinguished from other men. Men don't love the Church, but they don't

hate her. She is neither cold nor hot. When non-religious men argue about religion, nine out of every ten defend themselves behind the plea that when they look at the lives of so-called Christians round them, their Christianity doesn't seem to do them much good. There is a hazy indefiniteness about so-called churchmen that makes it almost impossible to tell which is the Church and which the world. These things ought not so to be. Many men at the front have been drawn by suffering to their first perception of the reality of religion. In moments of agony and peril many have knelt in prayer who never knelt before. And when they come back the Church, as a body, must give them not only shouts of triumph and worldly honour, but help to go on praying, help to lead the rest of their lives according to this beginning to which suffering has led them. When they come back they ought to have the chance of seeing quite clearly a sharp line cut between the Church and the world, between those who are following in the steps of Christ's passion and those who are not. When these weary soldiers, and the still more weary prisoners, return to those who love them, when the countless graves are left in sacred stillness, and the horrible trenches consecrated with crimson blood lie silent and deserted, nursing the memory of a million deeds of heroism unthinkable—after the war the members of the Church of Christ must set their teeth and say *our* war has now begun: the Church must and shall acquire a driving force, it must and shall become militant here in earth.

I think that the war can suggest to us three distinctive marks of a militant body. Two years

ago some of us wondered whether the great mass of the English population could by any possibility be roused to something higher and nobler than pounds, shillings, and pence. And then patriotism, or a sense of duty, or the sportsmanlike spirit, which are all varieties of one and the same indefinable instinct, drew them to their great self-sacrifice. One of the glories of these two hideous years has been the readiness of the multitudes who form what are called "the masses" to toss self into the cauldron at the imperious bidding of a common motive. It is this readiness to risk, this throwing of anxious caution to the wind, this refusal to wait and see, which the call of the spiritual war ought to give to the English Church. There was coming upon us a strange recrudescence of the spirit of the eighteenth century, the fear of enthusiasm. The fear of making false steps was beginning to paralyse us into making no steps at all. We need Mr Chesterton's reminder that what is worth doing at all, is worth doing badly. It is worth many mistakes in detail if the Church can only be roused to throw itself at the enemy without that over-caution in counting all the possible risks which makes victory impossible.

To take a single instance. It is worth many mistakes for the Church to try and produce some forms of service which will grip the heart and the imagination of the masses. Mattins and evensong, pieced together from the ruins of the medieval offices, have for four centuries consistently failed to do this. They are too solid, too severe, for the uninstructed; they make too much demand of intellectual effort and educated understanding.

Like an enormous number of sermons from English pulpits, they are out of reach of the congregation. Long psalms, long lessons, and long anthems in choirs and places where they don't sing, are largely responsible for emptying our churches. To expect the labouring classes to be caught, and interested, and inspired by them is like expecting a child who is beginning the elements of arithmetic to be enthusiastic over higher algebra. But we must be prepared to risk something. We must be prepared, for example, to take hints from Non-conformists on the one side and the Roman Church on the other. Both have good things that we should do well to use. And I think we must be prepared to allow various alternatives to be tried and tested for a few years, and then to authorize—not one, but two or three of them for use in different parishes and on different occasions.

But even if that came to pass it would not be enough by itself. It would not create for the Church of Christ that distinctness from the world which alone can give it a driving power; it would not remove its present hazy indefiniteness. The army must run risks, but it must be under discipline. If a vicar is thoroughly lazy, or thoroughly unspiritual, or thoroughly unsuited to his parish, there ought to be some way in which he can be relieved of his duty, as there is in the Army. If any clergyman cannot honestly believe the doctrines of the Church, he may be a highly moral, religiously-minded man, but there ought to be some way of preventing him from holding an official position in the corporate body which holds those doctrines. He was ordained only after making a distinct and

solemn declaration that he believed them. And, if he ceases to believe them, it doesn't make him a bad man, but it ought to make it impossible for him to continue to be a recognized, authorized teacher in the corporate body. One would think it was obvious, but England steadily refuses to recognize that if discipline is necessary for the Army it is necessary also for the Church militant.

And once more. If it is to have any increase of militant power, it must have an increase of corporate life, corporate distinctness ; it needs an *esprit de corps* which must be lacking to it so long as the Church is an abstract term to cover all the indiscriminate crowds of good-minded people who think highly of Jesus Christ. The shouting crowd on Palm Sunday thought highly of Jesus Christ, but He could not have said of them, This is My Church. It is true that it cannot in this world be confined to very pious people. That was a mistaken idea which the Church had to unlearn at an early date. But it can do something to make itself more definitely a body.

For instance, if the officers in the Church's army ought honestly to believe its doctrines, the privates ought at least to have a chance of knowing what its doctrines are. I have talked with many soldiers in the hospital, and their ideas are a fair index of the general state of mind. When a man says that there are only two religions in England, the Protestant and the Catholic—by which he means Roman Catholic—it shows that he knows very little of the doctrines of the Church. When a man states that Wesleyan and Church of England are the same, it is clear that no one has taken the trouble

to teach him the difference. Another man, who described himself as a member of the Church of England, asked if Confirmation were the same as being enrolled as a member of the Y.M.C.A. And it is very common, when you ask a man whether he has been confirmed, to receive the answer: Not so far as I know. Where is the driving force of *corporate* enthusiasm to come from if the members of the Church are not taught by those whose lives have been dedicated to the work of teaching?

But if the Church is to live a corporate life, it must—because its members are men and women of flesh and blood—it must be bound together into an outward and visible unity by the sacramental bond through which alone the individual soldiers of Christ cohere into an army. Not till the Holy Communion is recognized by the man in the street as *the* Christian service, *the* corporate act of Christ's army, will the Church with any effectiveness become militant here in earth. And this is not an arm-chair theory. It has been abundantly proved in practice in great slum parishes where dock labourers, costermongers, factory hands, and toilers of every sort, men as well as women, very early in the morning, before they go to work, flock to the Eucharistic service as a more respectable congregation flock, after breakfast or dinner, to a popular preacher or a performance of sacred music.

Let me repeat, the Church cannot in this life be composed only of saints; but we can labour and pray that it may be composed more and more exclusively of sinners who want their sins washed away, and who bind themselves together in a corporate life, by visible and tangible bonds of unity which mark

them off sharply from the world. The world may contain many good-minded people who think highly of Jesus Christ, but until they show that they are enlisted visibly in the visible army, they will lack the driving power of the united body which can carry it to victory.

The time will be long. God's great purposes will not hurry. But the Christian who lives in faith and hope is sure that Christ, meek and lowly, despised and hated by the world, is nevertheless riding in the direction of His eternal triumph.

Printed for ROBERT SCOTT, *Publisher*, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C., *by*
TURNBULL & SPEARS, EDINBURGH.

A SELECT LIST OF
**ROBERT SCOTT'S
PUBLICATIONS**

Theological & General Literature.

NEW WORKS FOR THIS TIME OF WAR.

By the Right Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D.

BISHOP OF EDINBURGH.

WITNESS : The Work of Disciples and Friends. For the NATIONAL MISSION. 2s. net.

THIS TIME AND ITS INTERPRETATION ; or, The Coming of the Son of Man. With a selection of Prayers for the Times. Dedicated to the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. 2s. 6d. net.

THE GOSPEL OF HOPE : A Message of Comfort for the Sorrowing, with Prayers for the Departed. 2s. net.

THE SHRINE AND THE PRESENCE. 2s. 6d. net.

Complete List free by post of Works by Bishop Walpole.

By the Right Rev. HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, D.D.

DEAN OF WESTMINSTER and sometime BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

LIFE AFTER DEATH. Addresses concerning our Belief in the Life Everlasting. *Edition de Luxe.* 2s. net.

"The teacher who would meet the needs of to-day would do well to model his teaching upon these really fine and helpful discourses. We thank Dr. Ryle for a timely and helpful book."

—*Church Family Newspaper.*

Books by the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

CONSOLATION IN BEREAVEMENT : Through Prayers for the Departed. A plea for the reasonableness of this method of consolation. 2s. net.

AN EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON S. MATTHEW. *Fifth Edition.* 12s. net.

"The best commentary on S. Matthew in the English language."—*Guardian.*

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN. 2 Vols. each 5s. net.

THE CONTINENTAL REFORMATION. 3s. 6d. net.

"A valuable survey ; we commend it to the general reader as well worth his attention."—*Guardian.*

LONDON : ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

From ROBERT SCOTT'S List

KNIGHTS IN ARMOUR. A new book of Talks to Soldiers, for distribution among Officers and the Troops. By the Rev. EDWARD S. WOODS, M.A. With Foreword by General Sir WILLIAM ROBERTSON, Chief of the Imperial General Staff. Illustrated **1s. net.**

ONE-MINUTE READINGS FOR NURSES AND PATIENTS. By F. K. KINDERSLEY. With Foreword by the LORD BISHOP OF WORCESTER. **6d. net.**

"These readings are splendidly selected and consist of passages of Scripture and verses of hymns. The booklet is attractively got up."—*Christian Advocate.*

THE TRAFFIC OF JACOB'S LADDER. Letters from Switzerland in War-time. By M. ROSAMOND EARLE. With Commendation by the Rev. J. STUART HOLDEN, D.D., and Foreword by the Rev. EDWARD S. WOODS, M.A. Illustrated. **2s. 6d. net.**

THE PRODIGAL SON. Addresses on the Parable of the Prodigal Son. By the Rev. T. W. GILBERT, B.D. **1s. net.**

"Models of clear exposition, heart-searching appeal, and helpful instruction."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

THE TEST OF WAR. By the Rev. J. T. PLOWDEN-WARDLAW, M.A. **2s. 6d. net.**

The Churchman says:—"Even those who are not wont to read sermons will peruse these pages with real pleasure. There are twenty-four discourses and they deal with the war from every possible standpoint."

GOD'S STRONG PEOPLE. By the Rev. A. W. GOUGH, M.A. **2s. 6d. net.**

The BISHOP OF LONDON writes:—"I have been reading 'God's Strong People' with much profit. They are true and virile sermons."

CHRISTIANITY AND WAR. By the Rev. H. G. WOODS, D.D., late Master of the Temple. Sermons preached in the Temple Church. With Portrait and Memoir by MARGARET L. WOODS and an Appreciation by the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. **3s. net.**

*Complete Catalogue of Theological and Devotional Literature
free by post.*

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

From ROBERT SCOTT'S List

By the Right Rev. HANDLEY C. G. MOULE, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE SEVEN EPISTLES. 2s. net.

"Short yet full expositions of the Epistles to the Seven Churches—devotional in character, but with the unmistakable note of the best scholarship."—*Record*.

MESSAGES FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. 2s. net.

"An inspiring and helpful book . . . Every page bears evidence of a tender sympathy and keen insight into human nature which is so characteristic of Dr. Moule's writings."

—*Church Family Newspaper*.

By the Right Rev. J. DENTON THOMPSON, D.D.,

LORD BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN.

PEACE, PERFECT PEACE: IN LIFE AND IN DEATH. 3s. 6d. net.

A message of comfort to those in trouble or sorrow.

Devotional Meditations on Bishop Bickersteth's great hymn "Peace, Perfect Peace," including a chapter on The Intermediate State, Prayers for the Departed, Heaven, etc.

"A volume of rare beauty . . . we have read it with great happiness and appreciation, and with no little spiritual profit, and we warmly commend it to all who are seeking for a message of peace and comfort."—*The Churchman*.

By the Rev. J. STUART HOLDEN, D.D.

CONFIDENCE OF FAITH. 2s. 6d. net.

In this new work Dr. Stuart Holden seeks to interpret the ways of God with the Nation and the individual and presents a view of Christian life and duty from the War outlook.

LIFE'S FLOOD-TIDE. 3s. 6d. net.

REDEEMING VISION. Cheap Edition. 2s. 6d. net.

"Full of deep, spiritual lessons, brought home by telling illustrations."—*Record*.

LIFE OF FULLER PURPOSE. 2s. net.

SUPPOSITION AND CERTAINTY. 2s. net.

By the Rev. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

THE PRACTICE OF THE LOVE OF CHRIST.

Studies in I Corinthians xlii. 3s. 6d. net.

Delightful studies . . . fresh, helpful and illuminating.

THE SUNSHINE OF THE GOOD NEWS. 3s. 6d. net.

CHRIST AND HIS SLAVES. Side-lights from the Greek

Papyri of Egypt. 1s. net.

ST. PAUL AND HIS CONVERTS. 1s. net.

WORK OF WITNESS & PROMISE OF POWER. 1s. net.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

The Library

of Historic Theology.

Edited by the Rev.

WM. C. PIERCY, M.A.

Cloth. 5s. net each Volume.

THE CATHOLIC CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH. By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE, M.A.

MYSTICISM IN CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. W. K. FLEMING, M.A.

THE GREAT SCHISM BETWEEN THE EAST AND WEST. By the Rev. F. L. FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER FAITHS. By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

THE PRESENT RELATIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION. By Professor T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc.

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AND STATE. By the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A.

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN. 2 Vols. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Prof. EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.

THE BUILDING UP OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. Canon R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. S. NOWELL ROSTON, M.A.

MISSIONARY METHODS: St. Paul's or Ours? By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN.

THE RULE OF WORK AND WORSHIP. By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

THE RULE OF LIFE AND LOVE. By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

THE RULE OF FAITH AND HOPE. By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

CHARACTER AND RELIGION. By the Rev. the Hon. EDWARD LYTTELTON.

THE CREEDS: Their History, Nature, and Use. By the Rev. HAROLD SMITH.

RELIGION IN AN AGE OF DOUBT. By the Rev. CHARLES J. SHEBBEARE, M.A.

Complete Prospectus of the Library of Historic Theology, edited by the Rev. Wm. C. Piercy, free by post.

Handbooks of

Catholic Faith and Practice

Edited by the Rev.

W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON, D.D.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt. Each 2s. 6d. net.

CONSCIENCE OF SIN. By the Rev. T. LACEY, M.A., *Warden of the London Diocesan Penitentiary.*

Addresses on the real nature of sin and our conscience in it, the discords which it makes in human life, and the way in which these are resolved into harmony and peace through repentance, confession, and forgiveness.

MONASTICISM. By the Rev. Father DEAN M.A.

CHURCH MUSIC. By the Rev. A. S. DUNN JONES.

DEFECTS IN ENGLISH RELIGION. By the Rev. J. N. FIGGIS, D.D.

CATHOLIC OR ROMAN CATHOLIC. By the Rev. T. J. HARDY, M.A.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

THE LATER TRACTARIANS. By the Canon S. L. OLLARD, M.A.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. By the Rev. H. LEONARD PASS, M.A.

RECENT FRENCH TENDENCIES. By the Rev. G. C. RAWLINSON, M.A.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ARTIST. By the Rev. ELLIS ROBERTS.

THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION. By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON, D.D.

THE RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, D.D.

EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By the Rev. DARWELL STONE, D.D.

THE SACRAMENT OF Penance. By the Rev. H. U. WHELPTON, M.A.

THE EPISCOPATE AND THE REFORMATION. By the Rev. Professor J. P. WHITNEY, B.D.

Of the making of books there is no end, yet in these days of Restatement it is felt that there is room for a series of handbooks setting forth the beauty and sweet reasonableness of Catholic doctrine in its various aspects by writers who are masters of their subjects. To supply this long-felt want, the following series of handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice are being made. To make their entry into the world of books, and if these volumes are privileged to bring the light and comfort of Catholic teaching to anxious or troubled souls the aim of the projectors will be fully satisfied.

From ROBERT SCOTT'S List.

THE BOOKS OF THE APOCRYPHA : Their Origin, Teaching and Contents.

By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. 16s. net.

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY.

By the Rev. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE, M.A. 5s. net.

MISSIONARY METHODS : ST. PAUL'S OR OURS ?

By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN, M.A. 5s. net.

Dr. EUGENE STOCK says :—" I earnestly hope that this remarkable book may be studied, conferred about, and prayed over . . . the chapters are most masterly studies."

MISSIONARY PRINCIPLES.

By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

MISSIONS : PAROCHIAL AND GENERAL.

By the LORD BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN. 2s. net.

PLAIN TALKS ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

By Dr. EUGENE STOCK. 5s. net.

Dr. Stock takes up in order the various doctrinal ecclesiastical and ethical topics to which the Epistles refer, dealing with them in a way likely to be of much service to Bible students and Christian workers.

NEW PUBLICATIONS FOR THIS TIME OF WAR.

THE GOSPEL OF HOPE : A Message of Comfort for the Sorrowful.

By the Right Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D. Cloth 2s. net.

THE REPROACH OF WAR.

By the Rev. Canon F. B. MACNUTT, M.A. Cloth 1s. 6d. net.

NEW BOOKS OF ADDRESSES.

STRAIGHT TO THE TARGET. A Collection of Apt Illustrations, for use in pulpit, desk, men's meetings, etc.

By J. ELLIS. 2s. net.

STEMS AND TWIGS. Ten-minute Talks to Children. Eighty-seven Outline Addresses.

By J. ELLIS. 2s. net.

THE KNIGHT AND THE DRAGON. Talks to Boys and Girls.

By the Rev. WILL REASON, M.A. 2s. net.

WHAT JESUS SAID. Talks to Boys and Girls.

By the Rev. WILL REASON, M.A. 2s. net.

Bright and original—will compel attention.

LAWS OF THE UPWARD LIFE.

By the Rev. JAMES BURNS, M.A. 2s. 6d. net.

FLOWERS OF GOLD. Talks to Children.

By the Rev. C. E. STONE. 2s. net.

THINGS TO GRIP. Addresses in Outline.

By CHARLES EDWARDS. 2s. net.

AN EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

On the Gospel according to
S. MATTHEW

BY THE REV
ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

WITH FULL GENERAL AND
GREEK INDICES.

Cloth, 12s.

"By far the best and most useful English work on St. Matthew that has appeared in our generation. Dr. Plummer's record as an exegete of the New Testament is a long and honourable one; and in this fine book it is not too much to say that he has produced a work likely to take its place as a standard Commentary of the highest class. It is exactly the book for which students have been waiting for many years."—*The Guardian*.

MESSAGES FROM The Epistle to **THE HEBREWS**

BY THE RIGHT REV.
HANDLEY C. G. MOULE,
Bishop of Durham.

Cloth, 2s. net.

"Each section of the Hebrews is dealt with in popular phraseology, but frequent references to the original Greek render the treatment critically valuable. Indeed, it is seldom that we have met with a volume at one and the same time so popular in style and yet so learnedly exegetical."
Homiletic Review.

LONDON : ROBERT SCOTT,
PATERNOSTER ROW,

